DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 107 093 FL 004 403

TITLE	The Ph.D. in English and Foreign Languages: A Conference Report.
INSTITUTION	Association of Departments of English, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	73
NOTE	56p.; A Special Combined Issue of the Bulletins of the Associations of Departments of English and Foreign Languages
AVAILABLE FROM	MLA Publications Center, 62 5th Ave., New York, New York 10011 ($1.50; 10 or more copies $1.00 each)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC Not Available from EDRS. PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*College Language Programs; *Conference Reports; Degree Requirements; *Doctoral Programs; *English Programs; *Graduate Study; Higher Education; Language Instruction; Modern Language Curriculum; Research Utilization; Speeches

ABSTRACT

This special issue presents the speeches, surveys, and workshop reports of the University of Texas Conference on the Research Component of the Ph.D. in English and Foreign Languages held in Austin in December 1972. Also included are updated papers and reports from the Purdue University Conference on Graduate Education held earlier in 1972. Reflections on the conference are offered by W.D. Schaefer, followed by a survey of doctoral programs in English and in foreign languages. Articles by G.N. Ray, J.T. Shaw, J. C. Gerber, B. Weinberg, J.W. Kneller, A. Cartter, and W.D. Schaefer cover topics including the Ph.D. in English and in foreign languages, relevancy and tradition, new roles for research, rewarding excellence and promise, and the future of graduate education. In addition, reports from conference discussion groups are presented. (Author/AM)

ED107093

THE PH.D. IN ENGLISH AND FOREIGN LANGUAGES: A CONFERENCE REPORT

A SPECIAL COMBINED ISSUE OF THE BULLETINS OF THE ASSOCIATIONS OF DEPARTMENTS OF ENGLISH AND FOREIGN LANGUAGES

ABOUT THIS ISSUE

This special combined issue of the ADE and ADFL *Bulletins* presents the speeches, surveys, and workshop reports of the University of Texas Conference on the Research Component of the Ph.D. in English and the Foreign Languages held in Austin in December 1972, with support from the American Council of Learned Societies and the National Endowment for the Humanities. The issue also includes updated papers and reports from the Purdue University Conference on Graduate Education held earlier in 1972.

A complimentary copy of the issue is being mailed to every department of English and of the foreign languages in a four-year college or university in the United States and Canada. It is hoped that this special discussion of graduate education will stimulate departments to undertake a fresh examination of their programs and goals. Additional copies of the *Bulletin* are available at cost from the MLA Publications Center.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

JUNE 1973

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Associate Member of Depts. of English
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

CONTENTS

Reflections on the Conference. *William D. Schaefer* 2
Survey of Doctoral Programs in English Departments. 5
Survey of Doctoral Programs in FL Departments. 8
The Ph.D. in English Reexamined. *Gordon N. Ray* 12
The Ph.D. in Foreign Languages–Particularly in the "New" Fields. *J. Thomas Shaw* 18
The 1966-67 Study of the Ph.D. in English and American Literature: A Review with Certain Attendant Remarks. *John C. Gerber* 25
The Myth of Relevancy and the Traditional Disciplines. *Bernard Weinberg* 32
Translation and Transformation: New Roles for Research. *John W. Kneller* 38
Reports from Conference Discussion Groups:
Foreign Languages, Group A. 44
English, Group A. 45
Foreign Languages, Group B. 46
English, Group B. 47
Rewarding Excellence and Promise. *Allan Cartter* 48
On the Future of Graduate Education. *William D. Schaefer* 51
List of Conference Participants 53

Copyright © 1973 Association of Departments of English, 62 Fifth Ave., New York, N.Y. 10011.

FL004403

REFLECTIONS ON THE AUSTIN CONFERENCE

William D. Schaefer
Executive Secretary, MLA

FIRST, a few words in a way of background. The idea for a conference to reevaluate the research component of the Ph.D. originated in the spring of 1972 during a meeting of the MLA's Committee on Research Activities.[1] It was felt that whereas in recent years a good deal of attention had been paid to undergraduate courses, teacher training, interdisciplinary studies, and, especially, new kinds of graduate degree programs, not since the MLA conferences of 1966-67 that led to Don Cameron Allen's *The Ph.D. in English and American Literature* had the profession paid much attention to the Ph.D. itself, and thus some kind of reevaluation seemed to be in order.[2]

With the approval of the MLA Executive Council, extramural funding for a conference was obtained from the American Council of Learned Societies and the National Endowment for the Humanities, with the University of Texas at Austin agreeing to serve as host. Gordon Ray, President of the John Simon Guggenheim Foundation and a member of the advisory committee that had worked with Don Cameron Allen in 1967, was invited to deliver the keynote address, and papers were also solicited from John Gerber, Chairman of English at the University of Iowa; John Kneller, President of Brooklyn College; J. Thomas Shaw, past chairman of Slavic Languages at the University of Wisconsin; and Bernard Weinberg, past Chairman of Romance Languages at the University of Chicago and a member of the Committee on Research Activities.[3] Some fifty participants representing a wide range of Ph.D.-granting departments were invited to attend, with over 90% acceptances coming from the original round of invitations. A complete list of participants with affiliations appears on pp. 53-54.

So that participants would have current statistical information on Ph.D. programs and enrollments throughout the country, a national survey was undertaken just prior to the conference, with the results of that survey providing the basis for much of the discussion. For best utilization of the limited time, participants were divided into four separate discussion groups, two primarily centering on problems relating to the structure and content of the research component of the Ph.D. (one especially oriented toward English departments, the other toward foreign language departments), and two groups primarily concerned with administrative policy, enrollments, and the job market (again, with one oriented toward English, the other toward foreign languages). In addition to the informal discussion that went on for the two days and two nights of the conference, there was considerable "formal" discussion after each of the papers and during the concluding general session, during which nothing was concluded and, somewhat miraculously, no resolutions were passed and no recommendations adopted. I must admit that in chairing the final session I had at one point hoped that some magic formula could be arrived at, but in retrospect I am neither surprised nor discouraged by the absence of formal recommendations, for I am convinced that one of the important results of the conference was the universal realization on the part of the participants that the problems presently confronting Ph.D. programs cannot and will not be solved by national proclamation. The responsibility rests, as it inevitably must, with each individual department, and there is neither need nor desire for a set formula that will fit all programs. There was, however, an encouraging openness at the conference: a willingness on the part of the chairmen to hear each other's news and views, and a genuine sense of community among this select group of decision-makers who have both the responsibility and the opportunity to seek ways to improve the work of their own departments.

As is true of all such conferences, there were no doubt as many different impressions as there were participants. What follows is my own impression, subject to my own prejudices as well as to my own expectations as to what I would have liked to see happening, whether in fact it really did or not. In addition to chairing the general session and working closely with the chairmen and recorders of the four discussion groups, I managed to visit all the groups during their discussions and, at one time or another, to meet with virtually all the participants. In this sense my "overview" is as likely as any to be a true reflection of the work of the conference.

* * * * *

I think it fair to say that if the panic and even, in some cases, the despair of the past three or four years has subsided, there was by no means an attitude of complacency or a feeling of return to "business as usual" on the part of the participants in the Austin conference. On the contrary, there were numerous expressions of deep concern as regards where we have been and where we are headed, and one heard a good deal about redefining basic issues and basic obligations. Most if not all of the departments represented seem, in fact, already to be involved in efforts to improve the effectiveness of their graduate programs, and although the details differ from department to department, I sensed broad areas of agreement as to steps that might be, should be, and in some instances actually are being taken to enrich and diversify present programs. Indeed, much of the apparent disagreement was perhaps more a matter of emphasis and definition than of basic philosophy, and I witnessed a number of discussions where both "radical" and "reactionary" spokesmen seemed, at heart, to be advocating identical programs.

It was perhaps not surprising, given the nature of the conference, that there should have emerged strong, probably unanimous, agreement on the continuing importance of the research component of the Ph.D., with considerable emphasis placed on the idea that sound training in research is essential not only for good scholarship, but for effective teaching. Somewhat more surprising was the very strong feeling on the part of virtually all participants that graduate degree programs should at least afford students the opportunity to do research that draws upon the resources of more than one discipline, a recent development confirmed by the surveys which revealed that up to two-thirds of English and foreign language departments are today permitting doctoral students to undertake some inter- or multi-disciplinary work in their degree programs. Considerable uncertainty continues to exist, however, regarding the propriety of a student's undertaking a "pedagogical" dissertation topic within the Ph.D., and opinion seems to range from support of traditional "scholarly" topics exclusively (e.g., "Imagery in *Paradise Lost*") to broadening the dissertation topic and much of the course work to include practically any pedagogical or professional problem within the broad area of humanistic studies (e.g., "Teaching *Paradise Lost* to Minority Students in an Open Admissions Program"). As might be expected, advocates of the former opinion, the traditionalists, if you will, most frequently suggest development of alternate degree programs such as the Doctor of Arts, or argue that the experience and training involved in a scholarly research program develop basic skills that are transferable to a teaching career at any level. Their opponents would be more inclined to argue that a rose by any other name does not really smell as sweet, and that the only sensible approach to the problem is to expand the scope of the present Ph.D. to include options more closely related to the realities of the marketplace. In partial support of this view, the surveys confirm that increasing numbers of new Ph.D.'s are taking jobs in departments that do not in themselves have graduate programs and in which there would be no opportunity for graduate-level teaching, much less for training new "research-oriented" Ph.D.'s.

In any event, it does appear that Ph.D.-granting departments are paying increased attention not only to interdisciplinary options, but to teacher training; roughly 95% of all departments now claim to offer supervised classroom teaching experience for their graduate students, and roughly one-third of all foreign language departments and over half of all English departments claim to require some course work in professional or pedagogical issues. There also appears to be increasing interest in the idea of combining teacher training, the study of literature and linguistics, and creative research into broad *programs* rather than confining specialized work within the traditional departmental structure. To what extent such programs can actually develop within the present university structure remains to be seen, and the development of any significant number of broadly based departments of "language and literature" is probably still in the future. It is, however, of considerable interest that the Austin conference was successful in bringing together representatives from both English and foreign language departments, with the participants subordinating specialized interests to a common concern with research in a "literature" Ph.D.

A related idea, one which was advanced by a surprising number of participants, was that the graduate research program, including the dissertation, need not necessarily involve an "original contribution to knowledge," but might more simply be viewed as a training program integrating all of the skills that should be developed for a successful career as a "teacher-scholar" in higher education. Some participants even seemed to advocate a dissertation that could be worked on during the entire period of graduate training. Two important concerns evolve, however, from this kind of practical approach to "teacher-scholar" training: (1) the need for continued opportunities

for post-doctoral education, an essential aspect of the MLA's 1967 "Recommendations Concerning the Ph.D. in English"; and (2) the need for emphasis on the methods and tools of research rather than on mastering a particular body of knowledge. In light of the latter concern, many participants at the conference were dismayed to see that the recent surveys revealed a *decrease* in required courses on the tools and methods of research; if knowledge of an additional language is also considered to be a research tool (as well as an essential "teaching tool" in courses that involve a number of different literatures), there is even more cause for concern in the changing patterns in language requirements for the Ph.D. Whereas five years ago the Allen report indicated that almost two-thirds of recent Ph.D.'s in English had been required to offer two foreign languages and one-third had been required to offer three, today the great majority of English departments require only one language and several departments have eliminated the requirement entirely.

As regards the matter of employment for Ph.D.'s, all participants were of course deeply concerned about the present tight market; although the surveys revealed that between 85% and 90% of last year's new Ph.D.'s "secured or were continuing to teach in college positions this fall" (a percentage only slightly below that ascertained by Allen in his study of English Ph.D. employment patterns five years ago), there was uncertainty as to whether such figures accurately describe the present situation (unplaced Ph.D.'s being "kept on" in departments for an additional year, large numbers of temporary or terminal appointments, etc.). It was also recognized that we have no figures at all on the number of Ph.D.'s who received their degrees two to six years ago and are now again on the market, either as a result of the disappearance of tenure positions or of "higher standards" imposed by departments that find themselves able to attract outstanding new Ph.D.'s. At the same time, however, many participants seemed to take to heart the recent warning of the National Board on Graduate Education against overreacting to the current situation and thus leaving the profession, say, five years hence, with an *under*-supply of new Ph.D.'s.[4] Over 75% of the English departments that produced ten or more doctorates in 1971-72 and a majority of the largest foreign language departments have already taken steps to reduce the number of full-time doctoral enrollments, and the surveys reveal that total enrollments in both English and foreign language graduate programs have already stabilized and are now beginning to decline. There was general agreement that students entering graduate programs should be adequately counselled as to the present state of the job market, but probably the one point on which there was strongest feeling was that Ph.D.-granting departments should engage in close self-examination of present programs and resources, and then make whatever adjustments are necessary to assure that their special competencies and/or unique facilities are drawn upon in preparing students to meet the kinds of employment opportunities that promise to be available.

* * * * *

The Austin conference was clearly no more than a beginning, a first step in the 1970's toward a better understanding of where graduate departments might and should be directing their efforts. There will be the usual follow-up to the conference—at the ADE-ADFL seminar in St. Louis this summer, at regional ADE and ADFL meetings in the fall, at the MLA Annual Convention in Chicago next December, and throughout the coming year in the *Bulletins*. But I would argue that ultimately the "Ph.D. problem" will only be solved through individual departments making an honest reevaluation of graduate programs in relation to goals that can realistically be met. The vast majority of the teaching positions held by Ph.D.'s are not now—and really never have been—in the departments that train Ph.D.'s, and to pretend that such is the case is foolishness. What, then, are the regional or national needs that a department, given its recent placement experience, can realistically hope to meet in the coming decade? How large a program, and with what diversity, is appropriate to prepare graduate students to meet such needs? In light of each department's self-analysis—and recognizing its legitimate desire to maintain traditional programs and traditional standards of excellence—what aspects of present programs are in need of revision, of expansion, of elimination? These are the basic questions, and they are questions that the "profession" cannot answer for us; the responsibility rests with each department to see itself as it really is—and should be.

[1] Much of the planning of the Austin Conference was undertaken in May 1972 by an ad hoc committee consisting of representatives of the ADE and ADFL Executive Committees and the MLA's Committee on Research Activities: respectively, Carl Woodring (Columbia), E. Robert Mulvihill (Wisconsin), and Winfred Lehmann (Texas).

[2] Numerous departments have, of course, engaged in self-examination and review, and at least two significant conferences have focused the attention of English chairmen on relevant issues: the "Bellwether" Conference on Graduate Education in English, 22-23 October 1970 at Amherst, Massachusetts; and the National Conference on the Future of Graduate Education in English, 22-24 April 1971 at Knoxville, Tennessee.

[3] Bernard Weinberg's paper appears posthumously; he died in Chicago on 13 February 1973.

[4] *Graduate Education: Purposes, Problems, and Potential.* A Report of the National Board on Graduate Education, 1 (November 1972).

MLA-ADE SURVEY OF DOCTORAL PROGRAMS IN ENGLISH

Introduction

In October 1972 a questionnaire containing fifty-four items was mailed to the 127 departments of English in the United States which offer doctoral work and to selected Canadian departments of English. The following observations and statistics are based on responses from 111 departments of English in the United States (87.4%). The 111 include the 19 largest producers of doctorates identified by Don Cameron Allen in *The Ph.D. in English and American Literature* (p. 21).

Degrees Awarded

After a period of steady increase in the number of doctorates awarded annually production is beginning to stabilize.

Year	Number of Doctorates	Reporting Departments
1969-1970	1,076	109
1970-1971	1,138	109
1971-1972	1,286	111
1972-73	1,275 projected	111

Doctoral Enrollments

Indications are that the number of doctoral enrollments is decreasing and projections suggest that enrollments in the fall of 1972 are lower than in either 1970 or 1971. Indeed, 54 departments report lower full-time doctoral enrollments in 1972 than in 1971 and 69 departments have taken steps to reduce enrollments, some as far back as 1969-70 and some by as much as 50%. All but 11 of the 48 departments producing ten or more doctorates in 1971-72 indicate that they have taken such steps. Some of the actions being taken are: limiting the number of admissions to doctoral programs (37 mentions), raising admissions standards (24), and reducing financial aid (8).

Year	Full-time	Reporting Departments	Part-time	Reporting Departments	Total Doctoral Enrollments
Fall 1970	5,985	97	1,478	85	7,463
Fall 1971	5,927	104	1,732	104	7,659
Fall 1972	6,282	111	1,787	99	8,069

Allen reported 11,595 doctoral students in 75 graduate departments in 1966-67, 5,875 of them part-time students (p. 167).

With 273 full-time doctoral students, Wisconsin is the largest doctoral program. 15 other departments report more than 100 full-time doctoral students: Berkeley (200), Texas (198), North Carolina (193), Yale (162), Illinois (142) Buffalo (130), Oregon (125), Columbia (118), Indiana (113), Michigan (113), Rutgers (110), Pennsylvania (109), Kent State (105), Brown (100), and Chicago (100).

Employment

The number of new full-time faculty members employed by departments awarding the doctorate has remained fairly constant. Although 23 departments expect to employ more full-time faculty in 1973 than were employed in 1972, 50 departments expect to do less hiring. Allen reported that Ph.D.-granting departments expected to make an average of 350 doctoral appointments each year to 1971 (p. 205).

Year	Number Employed	Reporting Departments
1970	428	104
1971	404	106
1972	414	109
1973	272 minimum projected in October	97

Placement

It appears that since the Allen study the most significant change in placement of new doctorates is not in the percentage who obtain college teaching positions but in the kinds of institutions at which doctorates accept jobs. The survey reveals that of 1,367 1971-72 doctorates placed by 94 departments, only 11.5% are "not employed in college teaching," whereas Allen's study revealed that of 1,880 recent recipients, 7.9% were not so employed. The present survey reveals that 47.7% secured new teaching positions or are continuing to teach in universities (Allen showed 62.2% entering universities), 35.7% are in four-year colleges (Allen showed 29.4%), and 5.1% are in two-year colleges (Allen showed .4%, p. 138).

Departments are taking their responsibilities to assist graduates in finding positions more seriously. Twenty-three departments now have a placement officer to work with candidates for positions and nine other departments have appointed placement committees. Departments are holding meetings on the job market and on dossiers for applying for positions, helping candidates to prepare and distribute dossiers, conducting mock interviews, canvassing potential employers, publishing handbooks with advice to job seekers, providing funds for postage and for travel to conventions for interviews, and holding discussions about the job market in graduate classes.

Gaining Teaching Experience

Of the 111 departments in the survey, 104 (93.7%) make supervised teaching in the department available to doctoral students. In fact, 4,148 teaching assistants are conducting classes this fall, a number almost as large as the 4,800 full-time faculty members at the rank of instructor and above in these 111 departments. 41 departments (36.0%) award credit for supervised teaching in the departments and eight of the ten departments which offer supervised teaching in a cooperating two-year college give credit for this experience. Departments also give doctoral students the opportunity to design and conduct classes, to work with senior faculty members in large sections, and to teach selected upper division courses.

Allen reported 72 departments offering supervised teaching (84.7%) and 27 offering a course in pedagogical methods (31.8%) [p. 197].

Learning About The Profession

Departments identified more than thirty areas of research strength, but the most frequently mentioned areas were American Literature (70 mentions), Renaissance Literature (65), Nineteenth Century British Literature (44), Modern Literature (34), Medieval Language and Literature (32), and Restoration and Eighteenth Century British Literature (22).

Tools and Methods of Research

Sixty-one departments require for credit a course, seminar, or series of lectures on the tools and methods of research (55.0%). Another 27 departments have such work available for credit (24.3%). Allen reported 46 departments (62.2%) requiring such work (p. 171).

Interdisciplinary Work

Seventy-four departments permit doctoral students to undertake at least some inter- or multidisciplinary work (66.7%). Comparative Literature (20 mentions), Linguistics (9), and American Studies (9) are most frequently identified as available areas. Among seventeen other areas described are Medieval Studies (7), English and History (5), English and Philosophy (4), English and Psychology (2), and English and Classics (2).

Foreign Language Requirements

The option of a reading knowledge of two foreign languages or a thorough command of one

foreign language is now the most common requirement for the doctorate (37 departments or 33.3%). Thirty-four departments (30.6%) still require a knowledge of two foreign languages, but 26 departments (23.4%) now require only one language and two departments have eliminated the requirement. Three departments require two or three languages and two departments still require three languages, one of which must be an ancient language. In a small number of departments, the foreign language requirement is extremely flexible: it may be determined by the student's committee; it may be partially or completely replaced by work with the computer or in statistics.

Allen reported that 64.9% of recent recipients in his survey had been required to offer two foreign languages and that 32.7% has been required to offer three (p. 173).

Comprehensive Requirement

A combination of written and oral examinations constitutes the comprehensive examination in 64 departments (57.7%). Only 8 departments rely entirely on the oral exam. The length of the comprehensive ranges from an oral of one hour and twenty minutes to a combined written and oral examination lasting twenty-two hours, considerably below the 48 hours required by one department in Allen's survey (p. 182).

Eight hours of examination is the most frequently reported length (8 departments), but half of the 67 departments reporting a given number of hours require examinations lasting more than ten hours.

New approaches to the comprehensive include an option of two projects of study and writing; a lecture as part of the comprehensive; teaching a class as part of the comprehensive; the presentation of an essay to the graduate faculty; and an examination individually determined for the student by the student and his doctoral committee.

Dissertation

A "traditional" dissertation remains standard in 84 departments (75.7%), but comments on the questionnaire indicate that the length of the dissertation has been reduced in many departments. Eleven departments will now accept a series of essays as a dissertation and six departments indicate that a "creative" dissertation is acceptable. Six departments will now accept a dissertation with pedagogical implications.

Recent Changes in Programs

Thirty-four departments report recent changes in their examination pattern and eighteen report recent changes in the foreign language requirement. The dissertation requirement has been modified in seventeen departments and the course and seminar requirements modified in eighteen departments. Only 38 departments, many of them with recently established doctoral programs, have made no significant recent changes in the requirements for the doctorate.

The most apparent changes seem to be redefining and condensing the comprehensive examination, reducing and redefining the foreign language requirement, modifying the dissertation requirement, introducing greater flexibility into the course and seminar requirements, adding courses in college teaching, and giving greater emphasis to the preparation of college teachers.

Canadian Departments

Responses from thirteen Canadian departments indicate that the production of new doctorates is still increasing but that doctoral enrollments have stabilized. Eight Canadian departments report that they have not reduced doctoral enrollments. Thirteen departments project the employment of a minimum of 5 new full-time faculty members for the fall of 1973 compared with 15 for 1972.

Year	Number of Doctorates	Reporting Departments
1970	39	13
1971	51	13
1972	51	13
1973	75	11

Year	Full-time	Part-time	Total	Reporting Departments
1970	492	127	619	13
1971	549	118	667	13
1972	502	118	620	13

MLA SURVEY OF DOCTORAL PROGRAMS IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES

RESPONSES to the MLA's fall 1972 survey of doctoral programs in foreign languages have been received from 172 departments, or two-thirds of the approximately 250 foreign language departments in the U.S. which award the doctorate. Since returns from the fields of classics and non-Indo-European languages were relatively light, and those from "combined" foreign language departments did not provide a breakdown by language family, the following analysis is based in some instances on the responses received from 132 departments of Romance, Germanic, and Slavic languages.[1]

Graduate Enrollments, Degrees Granted, and Hiring

Full-time enrollment in the Ph.D. programs of 126 departments totalled 2,771 in Fall 1972, a drop of 8.4% from the level of 1970 (3,026), 3.3% from the level of 1971 (2,865). Enrollments are higher in fifty-one departments, lower in sixty-one, and unchanged in fourteen. Among the languages, graduate enrollments have grown in Spanish (as also in the non-Indo-European languages), but have declined in the other language areas.

Twenty-six departments have taken steps to reduce new enrollments in doctoral programs in compliance with a quota or limit imposed by the administration; sixteen departments have raised standards for admission; and twenty-seven report that applications and admissions have declined "naturally" due to lack of funds for fellowships and assistantships. Twenty-one departments report that they anticipate further cutbacks in admissions.

Although the decrease in graduate enrollments can plausibly be interpreted as a response to the shrunken economy and job market in higher education, the figures for Ph.D. production in foreign languages still reflect the rapid growth trend that began in the 1960's: the same 132 departments that produced 450 doctorates in 1969-70 awarded 468 Ph.D.'s in 1970-71 and 534 in 1971-72, an increase of 18.7% over the 1970 figure. The most notable growth was in German (34.2%) and Russian; French, and particularly Spanish, were relatively stable. The same departments project a total of 610 doctorates to be awarded in 1972-73, but it can be assumed that the actual number graduated by the end of the current year will be smaller.

Of the 534 Ph.D.'s graduated in 1972, 450, or 84.3%, secured or were continuing to teach in college positions this fall: 254 in universities, 183 in four-year colleges, and 13 in two-year colleges. Although the Ph.D.-granting departments themselves hired more new faculty in 1972 than in the previous year (162 compared to 136), they project a significant drop in hiring during the current year (only 96).

Virtually all responding departments indicate that they actively assist their graduate students in obtaining teaching positions. While most departments employ the "usual channels," most notably the MLA's *Job Information Lists*,[2] some 68 departments still rely heavily upon personal contacts and correspondence between chairmen, and 17 departments send out lists or circulars describing their candidates to prospective employers. Only a handful of foreign language departments (12) have appointed a "job officer" or job committee from among the graduate faculty, and only three offer financial assistance to candidates to attend professional meetings.

Ph.D. Training and Requirements

Of the total group of departments responding to the survey (172), ninety-one require their graduate students to pursue training in the tools and methods of research, and another forty-five departments make such work available for credit. Study of professional and pedagogical issues is offered by fifty-five departments for credit, and is required by forty-nine departments. Almost all of the responding departments offer their students opportunities for supervised classroom teaching, normally as Teaching Assistants; in thirty-five departments such supervised teaching is done for credit.

A majority of the responding departments (98) require candidates to show proficiency in two foreign languages other than the language of their degree, while the number of departments requiring only one language (31) is more than offset by the number requiring three (33). In a few cases the requirement specifies competence in both language and literature. Only a handful of departments permit such variations as a demonstration of proficiency in computer science or a non-language field relevant to the candidate's dissertation. Table

2 shows the number of languages required among departments in the various categories of respondents.

The examination format preferred by four-fifths (138) of the responding departments is a combination of oral and written examinations; twenty-four departments require only a written comprehensive, and seven only an oral. The length of examination ranges from a two-hour oral to an elaborate, often protracted series of written papers. About half the departments require a total of more than twelve hours of examinations, and fourteen report twenty hours or more (see Table 2). At least four departments require a prepared lecture, *exposé*, or research report in addition to or in place of the standard oral examination.

The majority of responding departments report that their programs offer opportunities for interdisciplinary work, or at the least, a minor in a second foreign language and literature. Sixty departments participate in comparative literature programs, thirty-seven in linguistics. Virtually all responding classics departments incorporate work in ancient history, philosophy, or archaeology in their programs; Oriental language departments are generally involved in area studies programs or, occasionally, Oriental history and religion; and several doctoral programs in Spanish permit or encourage work in Latin American studies. Apart from the classics, Germanic departments appear to provide the widest range of interdisciplinary opportunities, including comparative literature (18 departments), linguistics (13), medieval studies (4), German area studies (4), humanities (1), European thought (1), and music (1).

About half the responding departments indicate that they have recently made significant changes in their doctoral programs. The most frequently mentioned changes include shortening or reducing the coverage of the comprehensive examination, individualization of training through relaxation of course and dissertation requirements, and a broadening of options for the minor field. Newly available minor fields include civilization, applied linguistics, and comparative literature. In a few cases the new flexibility in choice of minors has been achieved through the elimination of such traditional requirements as philology and Latin.

Appendix: Research Areas

Chairmen were asked to list their departments' three strongest research areas. Following are the areas identified by respondents, classified by language and listed in order of frequency cited.

French: 20th century literature (29), 19th century (19), 18th century (17), medieval (17), Renaissance (12), 17th century (8), linguistics or phonetics (5), stylistics and literary theory (4), Old French (3) critical theories (2), film studies (2), fiction (1), 19th and 20th century criticism (1).

Spanish: Peninsular literature, modern (24), Golden Age (23), Latin American literature, general (21), medieval (14), 19th century Peninsular (11), Latin American, modern (7), Linguistics (5), 17th century Peninsular (2), Golden Age drama (2), 19th century Latin American literature (2), Puerto Rican literature (1), Venezuelan literature (1).

Romance: Italian modern (4), Italian Renaissance (3), Italian medieval (2), Luso-Brazilian literature (2), Romance philology (2), Italian philology (1), Italian 18th and 19th centuries (1), Spanish-Portuguese historical studies (1).

Germanic: 20th century German (22), 18th century and Age of Goethe (21), medieval (18), philology and linguistics (14), 19th century (10), 17th century (8), literature since 1600 (6), criticism and literary theory (5), Scandinavian literature (5), Romanticism (4), German literature since 1945 (2), German novel (2), history of ideas (2), German drama (1), Lessing (1), Nietzsche (1), turn-of-the-century literature (1), Russo-German literary relations (1), Scandinavian linguistics (1).

Slavic: linguistics (7), 19th century Russian literature (5), 20th century (5), Polish language and literature (4), comparative Slavic literature (2), Czech language and literature (2), Serbo-Croatian language and literature (2), Old Russian (1), medieval Slavic literatures (1), Slavic folklore (1), emigre literature (1), structural poetics (1), computerized linguistics (1).

Classics: ancient history (11), archaeology (7), Latin literature (6), Greek literature (5), textual criticism (4), paleography (3), papyrology (3), literary criticism (3), historiography (2), Greek tragedy (2), Greek poetry (2), Latin epic (1), first century Latin literature (1), Silver Age (1), satire (1), medieval Latin (1), Greek and Latin philology (1), epigraphy (1), Greek religion (1), Greek philosophy (1).

Non-Indo-European: Chinese literature (4), Japanese literature (4), African languages and linguistics (4), Uralic-Altaic languages (2), Biblical studies (2), Hebrew linguistics (1), medieval Semitic texts (1), near Eastern linguistics (1), Near Eastern literatures (1), Finno-Ugric languages and literatures (1), Asian languages (1), East Asian linguistics (1), Tibetan (1), Buddhism (1), oral and written African literatures (1), Chinese archaeology (1).

[1]A breakdown by language has been provided by only seven of the sixteen responding Romance language departments which offer degrees in both French and Spanish. Three other departments classified in this category are departments of Italian.

[2]The December 1972 *Job Information List* contained entries from about 70% of all four-year college and university departments in which the five major languages are taught.

Table 1

DOCTORAL ENROLLMENTS, DEGREES AWARDED, AND PLACEMENT--FOREIGN LANGUAGES

	(French	Spanish	* Romance)	Combined Romance	Germanic	Slavic	5 Langs. TOTAL	** Other	Grand Total
Est.no.depts. in USA	34	35	29	98	53	23	174	72	246
No. depts. responding	31	24	20	75	45	12	132	40	172
Full-time Ph.D. candidates-- Fall 1972	711	453	575	1739	876	156	2771	513	3284
Fall 1971	768	438	584	1790	910	165	2865	514	3379
Fall 1970	857	426	581	1864	976	186	3026	527	3553
1970-72 % change	-17.0	+6.3	-1.0	-6.7	-10.2	-16.1	-8.4	-2.7	-7.5
PhD's awarded 1971-72	137	90	111	338	157	39	534	127	661
1970-71	125	93	80	298	131	39	468	89	557
1969-70	132	90	35	307	117	26	450	79	529
Projected 1972-73	180	80	118	388	180	42	610	128	738
1972 Ph.D.'s now in college teaching	117	84	91	292	126	32	450	102	552
Not teaching or NA°	20	6	20	46	31	7	84	25	109
% not teaching or NA°	14.6	6.7	18.0	13.6	19.7	...9	15.7	19.7	16.5

* Includes 16 departments of Romance languages offering degrees in French and in Spanish; plus 3 departments of Italian.

** Includes 19 departments of Classics, 11 departments of non-Indo-European languages (Near Eastern, Asian, Uralic and Altaic, etc.), and 9 miscellaneous or "combined" foreign language departments. (Estimated universe: 38 Classics, 23 non-IE, 11 miscellaneous.)

NA° = No answer; department did not respond to this item on questionnaire.

Table 2

LANGUAGE AND EXAMINATION REQUIREMENTS FOR THE PH.D. IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES
M.A Doctoral Survey -- Fall 1972

Departments	No. of Depts. Requiring Languages * 1	2	3	Average	Average No. of Hrs. for Comprehensive Exam.
French	8	17	5	1.9	13.2
Spanish	-	16	7	2.3	14.4
Romance	1	10	5	2.25	15.4
Germanic	18	22	1	1.6	11.5
Slavic	-	4	7	2.3	8.8
Classics	-	15	4	2.2	15.9
Non-IE	2	6	3	2.1	°
Miscellaneous	2	5	1	1.9	°
Total	31	95	33	2.0	13.2

* exclusive of the major language of the Ph.D. field
° returns insufficient for valid conclusions

Table 3

EARNED DOCTORATES IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES
1964-1970*

Academic Year	French	German	Russian	Spanish
1964-65	72	63	9	65
1965-66	80	93	9	82
1966-67	107	93	11	109
1967-68	152	117	15	123
1968-69	134	126	16	120
1969-70	181	118	24	144

* Source: USOE Earned Degrees Series, as reported in A Fact Book on Higher Education, Fourth Issue, 1971, published by American Council on Education.

EARNED DOCTORATES (MLA Doctoral Survey 1972)

	Combined Romance	German	Russian
1969-70	307	117	26
1970-71	298	131	39
1971-72	338	157	39

THE PH.D. IN ENGLISH REEXAMINED

Gordon N. Ray
John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation

WE ARE gathered here today for "close reexamination" and "frank discussion" of the current state of doctoral studies in English and the foreign languages. By holding this conference the MLA is in effect picking up concentrated and detailed consideration of doctoral studies where the topic was dropped four years ago. A study of the Ph.D. in English literature was begun in 1965 under MLA auspices. The MLA's Advisory Committee for the study published its "Recommendations concerning the Ph.D. in English" in the September 1967 issue of PMLA, and the late Don Cameron Allen's book, *The Ph.D. in English and American Literature*, appeared in the following year. It was intended that a comparable study of the Ph.D. in foreign languages would follow, but as you all know, the winds of political doctrine blew through the MLA's "constitutional convention" in the spring of 1968 and reached gale force at the Annual Meeting in New York that December. Since then broader issues of a marginally professional kind have largely engrossed the MLA's attention.

It will be useful, I think, to remind you both of the circumstances that led up to the Allen report and the recommendations which accompanied it, and of the reception accorded these documents. This in turn will suggest something of the atmosphere of the period 1965-1968, before the MLA was so rudely interrupted. John Gerber, Michael Shugrue, and I are the only persons at this conference who experienced the whole process of formulating the concept of the study, devising the questionnaires, attending the regional conferences at which about 110 heads of English departments considered the data gathered, and hammering out the recommendations of the Advisory Committee.

The impetus behind the MLA's study, and the principal reason why the Danforth Foundation proved willing to finance it, was the acute shortage of new Ph.D.'s in English that obtained in the middle 1960's despite the circumstance that the great majority of them (in contrast to new Ph.D.'s in the sciences) entered or continued college and university teaching. It was taken for granted that this shortage would persist, though by October of 1966 Allan Cartter was on record as forecasting a future college teacher surplus.[1] In English, indeed, Mr. Cartter predicted that this surplus would begin as early as 1969, though he did not believe that what the stockmarket calls a "turnaround situation" would occur at that time, since the predicted excess of new doctors would be used for some years to compensate for deficiencies in English department resulting from inadequate staff additions at an earlier period. The data gathered, then, were examined in the light of this question: how could more Ph.D.'s in English be produced in a shorter time?

Many of the Advisory Committee's recommendations were put forward in part as a contribution toward an answer: that work for the Ph.D. should be full-time study, that the Ph.D. should require no more than four years of full-time study following the B.A. (8 to 11 years of part-time study were the averages then reported), that one foreign language well learned should be an alternative to two or three superficially learned, that preliminary examination coverage should be less extensive, and that the dissertation topic should be one capable of completion in a year of full-time work (the average was then three years of part-time work). These recommendations were put forward as aspirations which it might take some time to implement. It was expected that they would have most effect on departments just beginning to give the Ph.D. and that established departments would for the most part go on doing what they had in the past. As usually happens, they represented a compromise among the members of the Advisory Committee. Some thought that the Ph.D. should be streamlined without the creation of a new degree to recognize "all but dissertation" status; others thought that requirements for the degree should not be relaxed but that such a new degree should be introduced. The compromise was to recommend both streamlining and the new degree.

Since the Advisory Committee considered that the chief value of the whole operation was to encourage self-scrutiny by English departments, it was felt that a high degree of candor about existing problems and deficiencies would be desirable. At the same time it was desired to entrust the report to someone widely known and respected in the profession. It proved possible to persuade Don Cameron Allen, Sir William Osler Professor of English at the Johns Hopkins Univer-

sity, Vice President of the Association, and for fifteen years a member of the editorial committee of PMLA, to undertake the assignment. The result was not exactly what the Advisory Committee expected.

Allen was one of the first doctors in English produced by the University of Illinois. He said in his report, however, that Ph.D.'s generally entertain little affection for the universities where they take their degrees, and this was certainly true of him with regard to Illinois. His *beau ideal* of a university was instead an institution like Hopkins where a few graduate students could be rigorously trained. Therefore he wrote his book in a sense against the grain, since he didn't really believe in the mass production of Ph.D.'s. But he had the scholar's compulsion to report his data fully and without suppression, and he experienced a kind of revelation as he worked with them. He noted in his preface that "the results of the survey astonished me. I have clearly been renting rooms in an ivory tower too long. I have had to put aside many of my ancient convictions—many of them lightly or too thoughtlessly held—and seek a new philosophy." And he dedicated his volume "to all the graduate students who have endured me and who will wish I had seen the point sooner."[2] I doubt if the dissatisfaction with the profession to which the responses of professors and graduate students alike bore witness would have come as quite so much of a shock to anyone who had remained familiar with the rough and tumble of a vast state university.

At any rate, many of the respondents did let themselves go in their answers to the questionnaires, and Allen did not soften the impact of what they wrote. Given his keen eye for the telling sentences in the testimony he was organizing and the wry wit with which he underlined their signficance, he may even have heightened the impression of disillusionment that these responses conveyed. Since your recollection of his report has probably dimmed with the passage of time, let me remind you of its tone and content from a passage in chapter six on the dissertation. Allen presented the difficulties encountered by graduate students in this part of their doctoral training by assembling quotations for their replies under four headings: "the Student, the Subject, the Supervisor, and the Surprise."

A. The Student
1. "I got scared of the Renaissance; it was too big for me and I had no Latin and hardly any German."
2. "I got even more bored than my director said I would."
3. "I lost interest."
4. "I needed classical and romance languages to carry on."
5. "I was not competent to bring a diffuse subject into form."
6. "I floundered."
7. "I chased too many dead ends."
8. "My undergraduate enthusiasm turned sour."
9. "I was too ambitious."
10. "It was beyond me."

B. The Subject
1. "It would have taken thirty years."
2. "I began to read Spenser looking for a topic, but I didn't like Spenser."
3. "My professor urged me to write on H. G. Wells, but I couldn't care less."
4. "I decided after a time that Wallace Stevens was not talking about something I wanted to think about no matter how attractively he expressed it."
5. "The project required mountainous reading of very dull material."
6. "I did some research on Victorian verse satire; then I decided to look for a fruitful topic."
7. "The necessary documents were unavailable until the death of a man aged fifty."

C. The Supervisor
1. "I wanted to work on a major figure, but the department head said, 'No, work on a minor one.' So I did."
2. "The first director was too vague to trust; the second thought my author only worth an essay."
3. "The professor who encouraged the topic retired; his successor discouraged it after I had worked on it for three years."
4. "Succeeded the third time; the second topic had been more thoroughly treated than my professor or I knew."
5. "After three tries I had nothing. The fourth time my director objected, I changed to another professor."
6. "Powers-that-be thought it too challenging; that is, they didn't understand it."
7. "After three topics he was satisfied."
8. "My professor wasn't interested in my results, and I wasn't interested in his topics."
9. "It was directed by two badly coordinated professors."
10. "After two years my director went on leave, and the new and more experienced professor advised me to abandon the whole thing."

D. The Surprise

1. "The whole dissertation had to be rewritten to suit *one man's* specifications."
2. "Half-way through a book appeared—the archetypal story."
3. "My professor refused to accept my conclusions."
4. "Someone else finished before I could."
5. "There was a Yale dissertation on the same subject."
6. "An authority on the subject pointed out to my professor that the subject had been done."
7. "After my advisor was called to another university, it was discovered that the subject had been used."
8. "Another student working under my professor turned out to be writing on the same topic."
9. "My director approved, but the committee regarded my dissertation as too narrow."[3]

In a setting of increasing campus politicization, lines of battle regarding the report and its recommendations were soon drawn. Staid and conservative members of the profession were appalled at the proposals put forward for changing the degree; this was not streamlining, they argued, but eviscer-ation. They were taken aback even more by the candor with which graduate students and professors alike had testified. Some of their protests, indeed, brought to mind Hamlet's words to Polonius:

> Slanders, sir; for the satirical rogue says here that old men have grey beards; that their faces are wrinkled; their eyes purging thick amber and plum-tree gum; and that they have a plentiful lack of wit, together with most weak hams. All which, sir, though I most powerfully and potently believe, yet I hold it not honesty to have it thus set down.[4]

On the other hand, the dissidents, who were usually but not always younger, found in the report abundant matter for their particular purposes. Streamlining to them was rationalization, and candor a cleansing breeze. There had been many earlier complaints about the Ph.D., from William James's "The Ph.D. Octopus" down to William Arrowsmith's "The Shame of the Graduate Schools," but never before had a discipline turned upon and rended itself in public. What clearer proof could be desired that the establishment was bankrupt? So the battle raged, to use the epithets of the day, between the zombies on the one side and the charlatans on the other. I pass over any account of the specific changes resulting from these debates, noting only that they were far more general and extensive than the Advisory Committee had expected.

The final turn in the fortunes of the report and its accompanying recommendations had its origin in the financial freeze which has blighted our universities during the last two or three years. Here we have a signal instance of time's revenges which reminds one of what happened to the Ford Foundation's *Managing Educational Endowments* of 1969. This study, which was widely interpreted by university financial managers as recommending common stocks (and particularly growth stocks), had the bad luck to appear not long before the bottom fell out of the market for such securities. Similarly, the MLA's call for more Ph.D.'s in English turned out to be a cry of "Fire!" in Noah's Flood. Established departments tooled up for increased production and accepted students in unprecedented numbers. Newer departments created the doctoral programs they were told the times demanded. But in the event, the surplus of jobs was no longer there. Hence the increasing dislocations of the recent past: the prospective Ph.D. writing hundreds of letters to department chairmen who have no positions to offer, vainly seeking job interviews at the MLA's annual meetings, and living through months of hope deferred as departments wait for their budget allocations until late summer—the whole devil's brew, in fact, with which the profession has become so distressingly familiar.

II.

So much for history. What is the situation that confronts the MLA today as it resumes its consideration of the Ph.D.? A prime element, of course, is our heritage from the immediate past. With the advantage of hindsight we must concede that the MLA's earlier study, whatever benefits it may have brought to the profession, did overstimulate Ph.D. production in the late 1960's. By encouraging more students to work for the doctorate and by shortening the period required to achieve the degree, "good old American know-how" then achieved another of its ambiguous triumphs. Between 1965 and 1968 an average of 815 Ph.D.'s in English was granted in the United States.[5] (I omit consideration both of Ed.D.'s in English, of which about 100 are given each year, and of D.A.'s in English, the production of which has thus far been negligible.) In 1970 the total rose to 1,060; in 1971 to 1,125; and in 1972 to 1,272. Mr. Shugrue projects a figure of 1,260 for 1973.

Serious misgivings concerning an oversupply of Ph.D.'s date back at least two years in most large English departments. The responses to Mr. Shugrue's questionnaire show that a substantial majority of these departments have taken steps to reduce new Ph.D. enrollments in doctoral programs and that some plan to take additional steps. These steps typically are to raise admission standards and to impose quotas on entering classes. Declining funds for fellowships and assistantships are presumably also acting as a deterrent. The consequence is that full time enrollment has levelled off this year, very much as the number of Ph.D.'s granted will level off in 1973. It was not to be expected, of course, that the change would occur any more abruptly. Since achieving the Ph.D. in English remains at least a four-year process, steps taken in a given year show their effect only several years thereafter. Moreover, an avoidance of drastic measures is surely prudent. Having witnessed the results of overstimulation, the profession should now be wary of the possible future results of understimulation.

That the MLA's well-intentioned efforts turned out to be a miscalculation was the result, of course, of the financial stringency that now binds American higher education. The jobs are not there because the money is not there. A yearly increase in the budget, which in the late 1950's and the 1960's came to be regarded as a claim of right, is no longer automatic, even when it can be supported by increased enrollments. Instead, many colleges and universities must make do with status quo budgets, which in a time of inflation means an actual reduction in resources. The orderly recruitment of new faculty is deferred. The contracts of untenured staff members are not renewed. When vacancies occur through death, retirement, or departure for another institution, the positions are not filled. This is a topic with which you are all painfully familiar, but even so, let me offer you three recent illustrations of it.

(1) I have just received a pamphlet entitled *Higher Education with Fewer Teachers*[6] which describes nineteen ways in which colleges and universities are increasing student-faculty ratios and provides an honor list of the institutions employing these methods. It is true that few of the institutions named are of great academic distinction (apart from law schools, which have always had a high student-faculty ratio), but even pacesetting universities are beginning to look in this direction. Indeed, financial necessity seems to have revived the abortive campaign of the late 1950's to transfer sound production methods from business and industry to higher education, a campaign whose chief monument was the late unlamented Parsons College. The ghost of Beardsley Ruml is knocking at the door!

(2) A Guggenheim Fellowship is typically used with sabbatical salary to make feasible a free year for the recipient. When hard times came, we wondered at the Foundation if sabbatical programs might not be curtailed with a consequent decline in applications to us. In the event, applications went up. Many colleges and universities cheerfully paid half salaries to faculty members going on leave, and then pocketed the other half by the simple expedient of providing no replacements.

(3) One of the liveliest current topics of discussion in the academic world is the feasibility of lowering the mandatory retirement age. Where sixty-eight was generally accepted a few years ago, sixty-five is now put forward as more desirable. Interest is also manifested by some administrations in arrangements whereby certain faculty members might be encouraged to retire early at the salaries that they would receive if they stayed on until sixty-five. But this approach doesn't really promise very much. Because of the vast influx of young faculty during the past twenty years, relief from such a source is not likely to have a statistically significant effect for another decade.

I wish I could report signs of returning prosperity on the academic horizon, but I cannot. It is far more likely, instead, that higher education will continue to wind down to a lower plateau on which it will have to live for some years to come.

Under these conditions, what are the prospects for new Ph.D.'s in English? I would first remind you of the broad field of employment open to them. There are 2,630 college or university departments of English in the United States: 1,104 two-year departments (whose designation is often "humanities," "communications," or something of the sort), and 1,526 four-year and university departments. Among the latter, only 130 themselves offer the doctorate. Popular impressions to the contrary, these institutions do in fact provide positions for most new Ph.D.'s in English. Mr. Shugrue has found that 89.2% of them obtained or continued teaching in such positions in 1972 as compared with 91.2% in 1968, the last presumably "normal" year. About 54% of the total are teaching in universities, about 40% in four-year colleges, and about 6% in two-year colleges. But these figures require a footnote. It appears that in 1972, Ph.D.-granting departments will employ only one new staff member for every five doctorates that they grant. When we consider that some of these new positions will go to senior appointees, it becomes evident that relatively few

fledgling Ph.D.'s will find jobs in departments granting the doctorate. And in view of what has already been said about persisting financial stringency, it has to be added that no great number of them will return to such departments in the forseeable future.

Since the great majority of new Ph.D.'s in English will teach in universities that don't grant the doctorate and in four-year colleges, we then have to answer the question: how appropriate is doctoral training as presently organized for such a career? Is there too much emphasis on elements primarily useful to instructors who will themselves be directing doctoral research? Should more attention be devoted to formal arrangements for ensuring that the new Ph.D. is a trained and experienced college teacher? (This question seems already to be receiving an answer. Many departments either provide such attention or have signified their intention of doing so.) And what of that largely untapped field, the two-year colleges? In 1971 they had 28% of the undergraduate enrollment in the United States, and they are growing more rapidly than any other part of American higher education.

If departments decide to place their Ph.D.'s in large numbers among two-year colleges, they should not expect to find a welcome mat before the door. Some of you will have vivid memories of the controversy between Colleges of Liberal Arts and Sciences and Colleges of Education that marked the 1950's, a controversy whose key document was perhaps Arthur Bestor's *Educational Wastelands*. Neither side won, and the educationalist's case can still be glimpsed behind the rhetoric of those now training today's two-year college teachers. In the October 16, 1972 issue of *The Chronicle of Higher Education* there was a proposal that Ph.D.'s should be "retrained and reoriented" to teach in two-year colleges. This drew a rebuttal from two administrators concerned with M.A. teacher preparation at the State University College, Fredonia, New York. Here is how they sounded the alarm:

> Doctoral programs are discipline-oriented rather than people-oriented; they subconsciously use professors in graduate schools as models worthy of imitation, and generally give only token acknowledgment of the importance of the teaching process. Indeed, the Ph.D. has been so manipulated by graduate study that he may be incapable of fulfilling the many roles required of a community college instructor.[7]

If it is indeed true that a two-year college faculty member must be "a student-centered person and a process-centered person," I suppose that few Ph.D.'s in English would willingly take such positions. But perhaps there are other points of view in the two-year colleges themselves. The militancy of the advocates to whom we have been listening itself suggests that the issue is by no means settled.

III.

In conclusion, I should like to offer a few general comments about the present state of the English teaching profession. I had better remind you first of the position of strength from which it continues to operate. Broadly considered, education is the country's leading industry. It was estimated some time ago that more than 60 million persons were in the education periphery (taking work in offices, on television, in the armed services, etc.), and this total was expected to rise to more than 82 million by 1976.[8] Nor are formal enrollment figures, at least for the next eight years, anything but encouraging. Our colleges and universities enrolled 8.5 million students in the fall of 1971 and 9.2 million students in the fall of 1972. The total is expected to reach between 12.5 and 13.5 million by 1980. English is one of the cornerstone disciplines of this immense field. About 8% of all university, college, and junior college faculty members teach English or journalism. The proportion of students taking English courses seems to have declined slightly (one hears differing reports from differing kinds of institutions) because of the dropping of required freshman composition and the rise of student interest in preprofessional training and in the social sciences, but this may well turn out to be a fluctuation rather than a trend. Moreover, English departments usually have a substantial credit balance in their institutions. They belong among the bread-and-butter departments. They do far more than their proportionate share of teaching. They are rarely housed in new and luxurious buildings. They require little money for equipment and research assistance.

It would seem, then, that the position of English in the practical world of institutionalized higher education remains secure. Yet it would be idle to deny that the morale of the profession has been shaken during the past four years. Its vision of itself has dimmed. The aims which it hopes to realize are less clear. Many of its members, even an occasional entire department, seem tired, distracted, and disoriented. Mr. Shugrue's questionnaires were not designed to elicit ringing affirmations of principle, but as I examined them I was

struck by the colorlessness of the responses. Where they were not cautious and formal, they tended to be perfunctory. What is one to make, for example, of these replies to a request for information about current doctoral dissertation requirements: "about a year's worth" or "very flexible–anything goes that will be acceptable to the student's committee (which is virtually handpicked by the student)"? One finds evidence of the same disheartened attitude in the highest reaches of the profession. We can all be pleased that Lionel Trilling, a professor of literature, was chosen by the National Endowment for the Humanities to give its first Thomas Jefferson lecture last April. But Mr. Trilling's address on "Mind in the Modern World" was somber indeed. One of his illustrations has particular interest for us. He found intimations that mind had reached the end of its tether in Louis Kampf's MLA Presidential Address of 1971, and by implication in the fact that the MLA should have elected as its president a person capable of such an address.[9]

Where should we turn for the renewal that the profession needs if not to our very subject matter itself? The value of literature remains unimpaired; the defect is clearly in our approach to it. Here we enter an area where each of us has his own convictions. I shall try to state mine as inoffensively as possible by presenting them not as suggestions that might influence the work of the mature scholars here assembled, who have completed their studies and formed their own views, but rather as suggestions about the most useful way of implementing the doctoral dissertation requirement.

My basic contention is that the dissertation should be an examination of some aspect of literature in its historical context. The old quarrel between scholars and critics, so prominent in the 1940's and 1950's, now seems played out. The responses to Mr. Shugrue's question about the dissertation, though they often include a formal obeisance to the concept of a "contribution to knowledge," take it for granted that this contribution can be critical as well as factual. Indeed, the vast majority of dissertations must now be critical. What I am proposing is that we should ask even of the critical dissertation that it have a research component, that the student should demonstrate therein his wide familiarity with the contemporary context of the literary works he has chosen to study. The result of this broad reading may well appear in the finished thesis only in the sureness of his interpretations, in the mastery he displays of historical nuances, but even so it will be well worth the time it demands.

The value in this approach would be negative as well as positive. With such a control the student would be under the necessity of making his dissertation something more than an exercise in intellectual manipulation, and his supervisors would be relieved of examining still another of those modish exercises in ingenuity and audacity whose chief purpose, it sometimes appears to the outsider, is scoring points in an abstruse private game. A recent *TLS* review of a book on Keats from one of our leading university presses will illustrate what I have in mind. Keats is treated therein, so the reviewer finds, not as an English poet but as "a plaything in the battle between the schools of American criticism. . . The real purpose of the work. . .[is not] to understand Keats, but to make use of him in order to understand contemporary America." Though it may help the author "to project these modern disquiets on to the past, and to employ poetry as a therapy, Keats himself undoubtedly suffers." Hence to the reviewer "this is a superfluous book."[10]

There will always be students, not very many these days (I find) but still a few, who like to study questions for which there are ascertainable answers, who take satisfaction in organizing and presenting a significant body of information. Such studies have the great advantage that their conclusions can be built upon by other students in the field. If these conclusions are to be valuable, of course, they usually require a tempering critical sense, just as I have suggested that critical studies ought to have a controlling historical sense. Such students should be encouraged to pursue their chosen topics, I suggest, even at the risk of an occasional dryly factual thesis of the sort against which the new criticism was a protest. If an English department has no pedants among its Ph.D's it may not have any scholars either.

It may be urged that with over 5,000 full-time English doctoral students at work, historical dissertation topics of significance must necessarily be in short supply. This is true, I believe, only if one stays within the conventional limits of literary study as traditionally defined. For example, the vast subject of the relation between literature and the fine arts is just beginning to be explored, and since the word "literary" has tended to be a term of abuse for art historians and critics, this exploration is being conducted largely by professors of English. The relation of the English poets to the iconographical tradition of their day has been or is being examined with most rewarding results: by Roland Frye with regard to Milton, by Ralph Cohen with regard to James Thomson, by Jean Hagstrum and a host of other scholars with regard to Blake, and by Karl Kroeber with regard to

Shelley and Wordsworth—to cite only a few examples. Double issue XIII-XIV of *Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama*, which has just appeared under the editorship of Samuel Schoenbaum, is devoted to the relations of the field with the visual arts. In the Victorian period the interconnection of book and magazine illustration with literature is turning out to be a subject of absorbing interest. Witness the recent essays of Hillis Miller on *Oliver Twist* and of John Stevens on *Vanity Fair* as well as the pioneer work of W.E. Fredeman (soon to be significantly extended by his student Allan Life) on the Pre-Raphaelite poets. Nor should I fail to remind you that the leading authority on Hogarth today is Ronald Paulson, a professor of English who came to that artist through his study of Fielding and other eighteenth century authors.

My last word is that, despite all our problems, we have some reason to be of good heart for the future. What the English teaching profession has experienced during the past four years has permanently altered its nature. It has been an exhausting time from which many faculty members have not fully recovered. Some of the old-time amenities are certainly gone forever. Yet as I travel around the country, I notice an increased resilience in English departments, a readiness to make the best of the changed situation, in brief, a new toughness. And of the importance of our subject itself there can fortunately be no doubt, nor of the capacity for renewal that it offers. As we move from an era of expansion into an era of concentration, then, we should remember that Matthew Arnold, who first gave these phrases currency, found equal opportunities in both.

1 *New York Times*, 16 October 1966.

2 *The Ph.D. in English and American Literature* (New York, 1968), pp. ix and v.

3 Ibid, pp. 66-68.

4 *Hamlet*, Act II, scene ii.

5 Lawrence McNamee, *Ninety-Nine Years of English Dissertations* (Commerce, Texas: East Texas State University, 1969), p. 15.

6 Washington: Academy for Educational Development, 1972.

7 Letters to the Editor, *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 6 November 1972.

8 Harold Hodgkinson, *Institutions in Transition* (New York, 1971), p. 6.

9 "Mind in the Modern World," *TLS*, 6 November 1972, p. 1383.

10 "Keats in Academe," *TLS*, 27 September 1972, p. 1106.

THE PH.D. IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES – PARTICULARLY IN THE "NEW" FIELDS

J. Thomas Shaw
University of Wisconsin, Madison

THE 1972 MLA survey spells out what we have known all along: that the overwhelming preponderence of Ph.D.'s in foreign languages obtain positions in our colleges and universities. This means that it is the accepted research degree for college and university teachers, for scholar-teachers or teacher-scholars, and that the number and type of such degree recipients who will find the career they seek is directly related to the needs and desires felt by the colleges and universities. These needs will obviously depend on enrollments in foreign language courses, and such enrollments depend upon student interest plus curriculum requirements. Foreign languages are always at or near the center of interest of pressure for changes in college curricula. Hence, before we tackle the question of the relationship of the Ph.D. in foreign languages to teaching, or the question of the research component in the Ph.D., it seems appropriate to take a look at today's situation from an historical perspective. We have been condemned to live in interesting times. Contradictory pressures

and attitudes are being strongly expressed today, and our situation, which I shall interpret as approaching equilibrium, may possibly be instead the eye of a hurricane.

Any understanding of today's situation requires some rapid examination of trends and developments over the past quarter-century. The present position of universities in general and foreign languages in particular has similarities with that of the early 1950's, when financial difficulties, cutbacks, and painful readjustments followed the receding of the tremendous surge of college attendance of World War II veterans. The immediate post-World War II period witnessed a far larger portion of the populace obtaining college training than ever before. By no means all of the students involved were totally content with what they found, nor with its direct applicability (or lack of it) to a career. Their coming stretched college facilities and faculties to the utmost. Their relative maturity and clear understanding of what college might mean to them led to dissatisfactions which, in turn, led in many places to adjustments in the undergraduate curriculum. Then the peak of that pent-up demand for college education passed. When my generation of Ph.D.'s came on the job market, in 1949 or so, the need for our services was becoming much less than we had been led to anticipate. The early and middle 1950's were not a comfortable time for colleges and universities and their faculties; they were a period of restricted funds and little development, with even the status quo difficult to maintain.

And it was about twenty years ago—during the period of these cutbacks—that William Riley Parker, building on the experience and interest in language teaching and learning gained during the Second World War, spearheaded the MLA's farsighted FL program. The program itself was not a graduate program, but by the time the next stage developed in American education, the MLA's FL program had helped to prepare the profession and the country for it.

That next stage was the immediate post-sputnik period, for roughly a decade after 1957. The dramatic evidence of the Russian achievement in science and technology led to a strong upsurge of interest in learning in this country; our place in the world, and, indeed, national survival seemed to depend on it. The general public assumed that knowledge produced and obtained at colleges and universities was what might save us. High schools and colleges were encouraged to upgrade their academic offerings, and students on all levels manifested the strongest specifically intellectual interest and commitment in the history of American education. College curriculum requirements were upgraded, particularly in the fields of mathematics, foreign languages, and the sciences. Increasing masses of students—including the generation of the greatly expanded baby crop of World War II and the immediate post-war period—sought college education. Existing institutions, especially in the public sector, grew rapidly in size. Community colleges were founded; former two-year colleges became four-year colleges; former four-year state teachers colleges became universities, and set out to vie in size and quality—and demands for funds— with the already established institutions.

The post-sputnik era had a tremendous effect on the nature and development of foreign language offerings, departments, and programs. The character of the already existing or newly upgraded curriculum requirements brought masses of students to foreign language courses, particularly on the first- and second-year levels. Faculty having desired qualifications were in far too short supply, and hence in the larger institutions graduate teaching assistants came more and more to be used, especially to teach elementary courses. This meant more graduate students could be supported, with resulting increased pressures for expanding graduate programs. Federal funds were made available for assisting in high school offerings of foreign languages. At the same time, the NDEA, through its Title IV programs, contributed directly toward supporting graduate students preparing for careers in teaching foreign languages in colleges and universities, as well as in other fields. And, in the so-called "new" fields of foreign languages, language and area programs under NDEA Title VI were developed in the national interest to help institutions offer multidisciplinary programs, for faculty to be provided to teach them, and for graduate students to be supported to take them. The result was a rapid expansion of undergraduate and graduate degree programs. Only a few of these new fields had had a modest existence in this country before the period in point: the Russian (or the East European) field, the Chinese, and perhaps one or two more.

That college education would become not only universally available but also universally desired was a generally held assumption in the early 1960's. As increasing numbers of students came to college, there was a rapid growth of institutions, departments, programs. Facilities and qualified faculty members were suddenly in short supply. Concern arose as to whether qualified faculty could ever be produced rapidly enough or in

sufficient quantity, even with the kind of assistance provided by the government and the foundations. The Ford Foundation launched a program to encourage the production of Ph.D.'s in less time—raising the question whether Ph.D. curricula needed changing or whether students supported through a Ph.D. program requiring constant progress toward conclusion would in fact be able to meet such expectations. This in turn raised further questions: whether the requirement for a "qualified" faculty should be changed, and, with the prospect of almost universal college attendance, whether the goals and purposes—and hence curricula—of undergraduate education should be changed. One heard it seriously argued in some quarters that colleges—like high schools—have the duty to grant a degree to anybody who has attended for the prescribed period of four years.

The euphoria of these years passed rapidly. With the success of the American man-on-the-moon program, the urgency of the intense pursuit of knowledge was removed. Elation over the remarkable success of our space program was quickly followed by disillusionment over foreign policy, especially the military involvement in Vietnam, and by increasing concern over domestic issues (the poor, the minorities, the educationally underprivileged, the environment). These dissatisfactions soon reached the point of violent confrontations at our institutions of higher learning. Among the general public, and also among students and to some extent the faculty, there developed an attitude giving far less primacy to intellectual pursuits, and, indeed, an environment was created in which for a time those who wished to learn or teach had difficulty in doing so. The public's attitude toward the colleges changed sharply, leading to great financial difficulties—of which the end is not in sight. Although by the beginning of the 1970's higher education had become available to a wider degree than ever before, some students were beginning to find out that what college offered was not what they wanted, and there were dropouts from lack of ability or lack of inclination for college. False notions of what a college education is and should be have been gradually fading away; one of the interesting signs of the times is a renewed and expanded public interest in vocational and technical training on the post-high school level. In the aggregate, institutions of higher learning grew to the point that they could absorb the number of students who came; indeed, some are now suffering from having to seek how best to utilize facilities built during the rapid expansion.

Strong pressures arose for yet another revision of the undergraduate curriculum. In the past, it had been generally held that every college student should increase his knowledge to his utmost in four full undergraduate years. Now strong pressure developed to consider the college degree as representing a level of learning achievement, whenever and wherever obtained. The argument was advanced that the level of high school training had been so upgraded that part of it ought to be directly usable for meeting college requirements. A strong tendency has developed toward use of national examinations (particularly CLEP) for granting college credit for knowledge demonstrated upon entry to college, and there are also pressures for a wide availability of prepared examinations for college course credit. Concomitantly, there has been a movement to bring in more and more students from educationally underprivileged backgrounds, while at the same time the thesis is maintained by some that the specific undergraduate curriculum requirements can be sharply cut back on the assumption that all students completing high school have academic-type knowledge of far greater depth and breadth than in the past. The preposterous assertion has been made that youngsters' TV watching has provided an across-the-board educational equivalent of a number of college courses. It has even been publicly suggested that there should be a cutback in the overall level of academic knowledge represented by the liberal arts bachelor's degree—that the degree should be basically redefined. Curricular revisions have occurred in numerous institutions, and in institutions where such revisions have taken place there has been a strong tendency to cut back mathematics and foreign language requirements to as low a level as they had before the upgrading of the 1960's, and to make it possible for high school training to be utilized as meeting part or all of the requirements in these subjects. Some institutions went so far as to remove the foreign language requirement from the curriculum entirely; however, few institutions have been willing to accept the proposition that in the world of today—with the knowledge explosion going on in all fields and with modern communications media bringing the world closer together—there is any justification for expecting students receiving a particular degree to have substantially less knowledge than has been expected in the past. One interesting sign of the times is that students of minority groups seem to be showing more and more that they do not wish a curriculum that could possibly be construed as something tailored to inferior abilities.

A reason for going into this much detail about foreign language requirements in the curriculum is

not only the immediate effect upon college foreign language enrollments, but the chain reaction which can be expected between any real lowering of college curricular requirements in foreign language and the continued availability of foreign language training in the high schools. So far, the cultural and intellectual isolationism that would be implicit in the removal of foreign language training from the total educational experience of graduates of our liberal arts colleges is only a potential danger. In my judgment, the less time and more options that some are calling for would mean less time in studying mathematics, the natural sciences, and foreign languages—and if ever really accepted, the possibility of their total disappearance from a given student's academic experience. This would mean a completely new definition of what college is for; it would mark the end of a liberal education, as it has hitherto been defined, and the substitution for it of something quite different. The removal of such skills and knowledge would mean not more but fewer options, unless a student takes more rather than less time in order to restore options for which he did not qualify himself at the optimum time. I do not think widespread acceptance of such a change is likely. In the matter of changes in curriculum, as in other types of change, I sense (I hope correctly) that an equilibrium has been or is about to be reached. It seems to me that a new plateau is developing in undergraduate foreign language enrollment expectations, so that rational staff planning can be resumed by college departments. And it is clear that our product—our Ph.D.'s—is still in demand. I think it will continue to be. Hence our deliberations about what the Ph.D. in foreign language fields ought to be like can be carried on in a sense of responsibility to the profession and the public, rather than a sense of crisis—although, to be sure, the next few years are going to be difficult and painful, and we are going to need to call on the government at various levels (and on the foundations) for ways of best meeting the problems that have arisen and will arise.

Before looking specifically at the question of the research component of the Ph.D., perhaps we should make some generalizations about the desired qualities of all college teachers in foreign language fields, including teachers with the Ph.D. There has always been a touchy "conflict of interest" between command of the foreign language itself and the ability and willingness to teach that language as language, on the one hand, and the competence to teach the substantive fields of literature and linguistics of that language, on the other. Some years ago the notion was prevalent that qualified natives could be found to teach all foreign language courses willingly and cheaply, and that the only thing needed was an instructor with native knowledge of a foreign language to work together with a trained linguist who would need no knowledge of the language whatever. This idea was found to be, at best, a stopgap measure until natives of the foreign language could be properly trained to teach their language to Americans or until Americans could be found to teach the foreign language.

The first of the qualifications of the teacher of a foreign language as such is that he possess an adequate mastery of that language. If he does not have native knowledge of that language, his graduate training or early professional position should include the possibility of residence or study in the country where the language is spoken natively, and for revisiting from time to time for refresher experience in the language itself. All students preparing to teach a foreign language in college should, furthermore, be given the opportunity to teach the language, under supervision, while in graduate school; it would be desirable for them to have had a course in language teaching techniques, including familiarity with available language textbooks. All of them should have had enough study of the linguistics of the language so that what they say about the nature, structure, and phonology of the language will be scientifically accurate, or at least not stupidly erroneous. This training in linguistics is as necessary, or perhaps even more so, for the language teacher who is a native speaker of the foreign language being taught. When properly qualified native speakers are available it is usually advisable that they be the teachers of advanced conversation and composition courses.

College third-year and higher level courses in a foreign literature and all courses in its linguistics require substantive knowledge of the discipline, and should be taught by individuals who have received graduate-level training in these fields, ideally to the point of having real mastery of the up-to-date knowledge of the subject field.

There are three fields of research in the area of foreign languages: (1) how to teach the language as language; (2) its linguistics, as a field of knowledge; and (3) its literature, as a field of knowledge. Research in how to teach a foreign language is an appropriate subject for a Ph.D. in education rather than a foreign language department as such. A program to produce such a researcher should operate with close cooperation between the school of education and the appropriate foreign language department; it would in-

volve direct experimentation in effective means of teaching the foreign language to English-speaking students in this country. There is continuing need for such research, which is in lamentably short supply and is needed to make it possible to replace unsubstantiated assertions with factual knowledge concerning the relative effectiveness of particular means and methods of teaching foreign language. A person receiving a degree in this field would be preparing for a post in a school of education, or better, a joint appointment in teacher education and in a foreign language department.

The Ph.D.'s produced by a language department will be specialists in the literature or the linguistics of that language, or a combination of the two, perhaps with further competence in one or more additional fields. Specialization in the linguistics of a foreign language has become more popular in recent years—particularly in the "new" language fields; it seems to be more and more accepted in the "older" languages as well. However, it would seem that the far greater number of specialists in language departments will continue to be in literature. There should be an appropriate linguistics component in the literary specialist's training, just as there should be an appropriate literature component in the linguist's training. I sense a hopeful sign in the increasing attention that seems to be given to the study of poetics and the aesthetic use of language—the place where the interests of the linguist and the literature specialist converge.

This gets us to the question of the research component of the Ph.D. and its relationship to the preparation of college and university teachers. I propose to risk carrying a coal to Newcastle in arguing that the so-called "conventional dissertation," properly applied and properly extended to new combinations and new approaches, is not at all an impediment to good college teaching, but, on the contrary, is a necessary adjunct to it. I shall conclude by discussing briefly some of the problems of the "new" language fields, and some implications which study in these fields may possibly have for the more traditional ones.

We should have clearly in mind what we mean by a "traditional" dissertation. Perhaps we can agree on the following definition:

> A dissertation must be a scholarly study which provides a substantial original contribution to knowledge. Its three principal requirements are (1) sufficient unity, complexity, and magnitude; (2) thoroughness; and (3) consistent method . . . The subject must be so selected that it can be investigated thoroughly within the dissertation, using a consistent method, in such fashion that all the relevant materials are examined in the dissertation itself, and the conclusions of the dissertation flow from the evidence directly presented in it.

This definition is one that could be used in any humanistic discipline, and perhaps many others. Such a definition can include new approaches to learning, new tools, new subject areas or combinations, contemporary as well as older. It is a definition which will make it possible for the doctoral candidate to fit into the learned community of his colleagues in the entire range of disciplines of a college or university. My department gives its students the following advice about preparing for a dissertation:

> The student should start reading widely in the field of the proposed dissertation as soon as he can define his interest in it, and then center in more and more toward the specific subject. He must be knowledgeable in the broad field of the dissertation; he must read in it enough to be at home in it, to know what kind of research is going on in it, to be aware of the basic opinions and interpretations and of problems and possible solutions, and to have an understanding of the position and importance of the subject in the field.

The old dichotomy of difference in aim and focus between undergraduate and graduate *learning* still holds: the undergraduate's focus is on learning the central portion of what is known about a particular subject; the graduate's focus is on the limits of knowledge in a particular subject, so as to discover where advances in knowledge may be fruitfully attempted. As knowledge in a particular field advances, the center of knowledge changes, and much that was considered knowledge is replaced by new knowledge. The graduate teacher, by definition, should be interested in the advance of knowledge. But the undergraduate teacher as well must be always aware of the current state of knowledge in the field in which he is teaching, and must continually evaluate critically current knowledge and its limits, new knowledge and its importance. I submit that doing a doctoral dissertation gives the best experience, not only for preparing the future researcher, but also for giving the future college and university teacher the opportunity and impetus to learn a field well enough to discover the limits and limitations of knowledge about it. As regards literary study, here he can learn the difference between sensibility and sense, between impressionism and knowledge, and how sensibility and impressionism can, through scholarship, result in sense and knowledge.

When the graduate student passes his M.A. and Ph.D. preliminary examinations, he proves that he possesses adequate command of the current knowledge in the fields in which he is examined for general substantive undergraduate teaching. Until that knowledge is out of date, he can use it for teaching, even though he may still lack the teaching dimension that the Ph.D. dissertation can give him. The non-Ph.D.'s knowledge will go out of date, if he does not systematically keep it alive and fresh. The Ph.D.'s knowledge will go out of date, too, if he does not keep up. In practice, the only effective way of "keeping up" is by remaining oneself at the threshold of knowledge, by working toward producing new knowledge.

New knowledge must be tested by those capable of testing it—in the humanities as well as in the natural sciences or anywhere else. New knowledge has not been totally attained until it has been worked out and then tested—not only against the relatively inexperienced perceptions and limited knowledge of our students, but against the perception and knowledge of our peers. Here lies the entire crux of the question of publication: new knowledge cannot be considered knowledge until it has become publicly known and had the opportunity to be tested. He who has done a dissertation has learned from experience not only how to—but that he can—solve a problem of some magnitude and complexity. If he can solve that problem, then he has shown that he has developed disciplined ways that can be used for solving further problems.

The graduate student should obtain practice in doing both of the kinds of research writing that he will do if he becomes an active scholar: the book-length manuscript and the article. Unlike the situation in some other fields, the book remains in our field perhaps the central vehicle for presenting new knowledge to an appropriate public. The other viable means of publishing research, of course, is the article of publishable length—which means about twenty pages in double-spaced typescript. As a graduate student I was given the advice I have used ever since: that term papers and seminar papers be within this scope, so that one will be obtaining practice in choosing subjects and treating them in a manner appropriate for one's later career. Doing such course papers also can prepare the student for writing the chapters of his dissertation and for the articles which he may draw from it, for reworking course and seminar papers until they have publishable depth and contribution, and for writing on new subjects. The dissertation gives indispensable experience, under supervision, for tackling a relatively large problem and dividing it up into manageable pieces—and of organizing this complexity into a suitable unity. A dissertation, like a book, is much more than the sum of its chapters, no limited number of separate studies can be an adequate substitute for it. At the same time, a dissertation in our field today should not, in my judgment, itself be or aim at the precise nature of a book. It is a rare dissertation that can be published as a book without substantial revision to make it accessible to a wider audience. A book on (or including) the subject of a dissertation can be built upon what has been demonstrated there, and can use selectively for illustration the thorough and detailed presentation of evidence in the dissertation. Thus the dissertation gives the serious scholar-to-be invaluable experience in preparing him for his future books. At the same time, it gives to him or to any other teacher—undergraduate or graduate—the indispensable experience of getting deeply enough into a field to be able to give a critical evaluation not only of what is considered knowledge in the field at a particular moment, but also of further developments in that knowledge during his teaching career.

My title suggested that I would have something to say about the "new" language fields. What I have said so far is about equally applicable to all language fields, I should think, and much of it may have considerably broader application. The central characteristic in opening up these new language fields has been that in every case it has involved multidisciplinary study—an approach familiar enough to classicists, but not hitherto applied in this country to modern languages and literatures. Only in the last two or three years have a few isolated programs in "German Studies" and "French Studies" begun to appear.

First let me say a word about the development of the new fields. Since World War II, the Slavic field has developed from something barely existing to a field accepted on an academic par with far more traditional disciplines in many important American institutions. There has also been enormous growth and development in Latin American studies, so that Latin American literatures and cultures are being studied in their own right rather than as an adjunct to European Spanish or Portuguese literature and culture. New fields of language and area study have developed in African languages and literatures, the languages and literatures of the Middle East, of South Asia (India, Pakistan, and others), of East Asia (China, Japan, Korea), and now, of Southeast Asia (the Philippines, Vietnam, Thailand, Indonesia).

For all these fields, the questions of curriculum, standards, examinations, the research components of degrees, the attitude toward language knowledge (in breadth and depth) have had to be looked at freshly. Questions have had to be raised on how to teach the individual language, what research possibilities exist in its linguistics, what research possibilities exist in its literature, including perhaps its folk literature, and, in some areas, the interrelation between the arts and literature and the importance of the various arts in the culture. A particularly interesting question has arisen, especially in the study of the non-Christian cultures: the relationship of religion to culture, and of religion and culture to an understanding and appreciation of the literature. Some of these fields have an extensive tradition of study and research in the native language. In some of them, such as Russian, the massive modern research has been from a point of view quite different from that of Western scholarship and is intertwined with an established ideology quite different from our way of thinking—though the technical level of the scholarship is sufficiently high that it must be taken into account in any serious study. An interesting question flows from this: should new knowledge produced in this country with regard to Russian literature be from the point of view of the Russians or of the Americans? If of the Russians, which Russians? How successful can we be in living up to what our Soviet friends call "bourgeois objectivism"? Should new knowledge of Latin American literature be from the point of view of the European Spaniard or Portuguese, of the Latin American, or of a native of this country? Should study of India be from the point of view of the Hindu scholar, or the Urdu, or the Pakistani, or the American? Or of all of them? The same question can be asked in each country. The answer seems to be that new knowledge produced must take into account the point of view of the native of the country involved—knowledge to be tested not only by Americans, but by natives and scholars of the country and civilization involved. However, the point of view of the scholarship need not be and cannot be expected to be identical with that of the native. Religion and culture, particularly as regards the arts, are likely to play a much more central role in scholarship and understanding than we have been inclined to grant them explicitly in our own scholarship with regard to the West.

I should like to raise the question whether German scholarship or French scholarship or Italian scholarship in this country should be expected to fit snugly into scholarship being done in Germany, France, Italy. Is a book on French literature the better or worse for being first published in France? In my undergraduate and graduate days, I found the Gallic point of view of Legois and Cazamian stimulating as casting a different light on English literature. I can tell you from experience that the Russians read and react to Western scholarship in the fields of Russian linguistics and Russian literature. Our students in the field of Russian literature cannot be allowed to remain ignorant of scholarship on that literature published in other countries—particularly Germany, France, Scandinavia, Holland, Italy. Knowledge of German and French is indispensable for our students. My question to our brethren in English and American literature is one of puzzled incredulity: how can it be seriously argued that a writer of a dissertation in your field can get by on what has been and is being written in the English language alone?

Problems the so-called "new" language fields face are manifold: How many languages may or should be learned? What level of competence should be required in each? How can a reasonable balance be established between breadth of knowledge desired in the larger field and depth in a more limited area of it? How "popularizing" for Americans, and how basic, should be the focus of research and teaching? How can one go about finding appropriate research methods for handling studies of "culture," particularly as regards the other arts, and also religion or ideology, in connection with literature? As was recently pointed out in the Lambert report, the language and area studies in the East European area (including the Russian) have remained far more discipline-oriented in the usual sense than have the others.

If I had life and time, I would like to speak of the desirability for means of support to be found for team-oriented research or groupings of suitable dissertation topics, something that can be done with students still having the degree of individuality and responsibility we expect of them in their dissertations. I shall speak just enough to mention three areas of my own personal interest in which students of mine are working: the first is on the nature of Russian Romanticism, in its manifestation in Russia itself and then in comparison and contrast with this literary movement in Western Europe. (Generalizations about the European Romantic movement need to include the Russians; but if the attempt is made to do so, the Romantic period and its antecedents in at least France,

England, and Germany may have to be looked into further.) I am interested in the problem of what happened to literary genres in Pushkin's time, and particularly in his use of them, and my students are tackling them one at a time to find out. I am interested in the application of the computer to the study of poetics: I am approaching completion of a large-scale project on Pushkin's rhymes, utilizing the computer, with two other poets as controls. The methods used need to be applied to a number of other poets, so as to learn more on how to interpret artistically this technical aspect of a poet's works, and so also to develop a new history of Russian rhyming. The methods and computer programs used have been devised so as to be adaptable, at least to a considerable degree, to studying the poetics of other literatures. And I would be further along in that study if it had not been interrupted for the preparation of this paper.

THE 1966-67 STUDY OF THE PH.D. IN ENGLISH AND AMERICAN LITERATURE: A REVIEW WITH CERTAIN ATTENDANT REMARKS

John C. Gerber
University of Iowa

WHEN Mike Shugrue asked me to review the 1967 study, I agreed rather too easily. At the time I thought it would be a relatively simple and pleasant task simply to pay tribute to the men who inspired the study and to recall the pleasant opportunity offered those of us on the English Advisory Committee to meet with department chairmen throughout the country. For they *were* pleasant times. We talked amiably and excitedly about the demand for our graduates. We gloated over the increases in our enrollments and budgets, and over the distinguished professors that we had been able to steal from one another. We were even able to laugh without animosity about our colleagues who spent more time in Europe on research grants than they did sharing the load of our departments. And in true entrepreneurial argot we talked of speeding up production, getting the bulge out of the pipeline, and acquiring more manpower and developing more efficiency. It was an age of innocence, and it was only five years ago.

The fundamental purpose of the 1967 study was to explore ways in which we could meet the startling demand for college teachers of English. Since 1967, as I need not tell this audience, that demand has dwindled into a shadow of what it was. Hence while many of the recommendations in the study still retain some vitality, the study taken as a whole seems dated, even quaint. We made two major assumptions that with the help of hindsight we realize now we should not have made. The first was that the great demand for our graduates would continue indefinitely. The second was that our graduate programs, if a little inefficient, were sound enough not to require any ruthless questioning of their ends and means.

The first assumption, that the great demand for our graduates would continue indefinitely, seemed wholly reasonable. Supporting statistics, for example, were awesome. Government experts estimated that there had been six million undergraduates in American colleges and universities in 1965, and that this number was increasing by a quarter million each year. They predicted seven million for 1969 and, with further acceleration, nine million for 1975. English majors—there had been 61,000 of them as far back as 1962-1963—were increasing at the rate of 15% annually. And Don Allen's statisticians estimated that "within several years" 80,000 additional *sections* of freshman English would have to be organized. Additionally, the Allen report surmised that two thousand universities, four-year colleges, and community and junior colleges were "hungering" for Ph.D's in English—and new community and junior colleges were opening their doors every month. "Can this shortage be solved," the Allen report asks, "or should we regard it as chronic?" Note that there is no intimation in this question that the shortage might disappear for reasons outside our profession. Indeed, Allan Cartter's prediction of a constricting market was laughed off as arrant nonsense.

So we set about exploring possibilities for increasing the supply of college teachers of English. The possibility of resurrecting the master's program for this purpose was considered but quickly dismissed. Its value, as Don Allen pointed out, had been questioned as early as 1898, and since then it had been smothered by the Ph.D. In the words of Dean Arlt, it could not be "sold."

To some, an interim degree offered greater promise. We took note of the new Master of Philosophy degree at Yale, the Candidate of Philosophy program at Michigan, and the Doctor of Arts degree being considered at Berkeley, Carnegie, and elsewhere. The Allen report records that there was a division of opinion on the subject of intermediate degrees but refrains from regenerating the steam in the arguments. At every one of the regional meetings there were those who thought the intermediate degree the solution to our every problem, and there were others who thought it only a "baby Ph.D.," a "seal for the second-class," a "refuge for the blind and halt." On the questionnaire, 62.8% of the respondents thought the intermediate degree made sense. But they were more evenly divided on whether it should be a terminal degree, and whether a D.A. from one university should be eligible for a Ph.D. from another university simply by writing a dissertation. Three-fourths of the department chairmen said that they would appoint a D.A. to an instructorship, but only one-fourth were willing to exalt him to an assistant professorship or grant him tenure. Clearly the D.A. was not a raft on which the profession as a whole was willing to float to safety.

If there was to be any viable solution to the problem of teacher shortage, it was generally agreed that it must be found in the doctoral program. We simply *had* to speed up the productions of Ph.D.'s. So the Allen report ultimately appeared with a cover showing hands holding what is clearly a chapter from a dissertation.

Specifically, those participating in the study recommended, among other things, that every doctoral candidate should engage in full-time study; that one foreign language and literature be allowed as a substitute for the current two- and three-language requirements; that classes for students beyond the M.A. level be small; that the large examination, call it the preliminary or comprehensive, be reduced in scope; that practice in teaching be confined to one class each semester in the second and third years; that a series of related essays be acceptable as a dissertation; and that the oral defense of the dissertation be abolished. Recommendation No. 4 put it all together: "The Ph.D in English should require no more than four years of full-time study following the B.A." There were murmurs in the regional discussions that some of these recommendations were impractical, especially the one requiring all students to engage in full-time study. Where was their financial support to come from? But the majority were in a hopeful if not a joyous mood. Graduate deans, Woodrow Wilson, the federal government, the student himself, or even God would supply.

There was no recommendation, it might be noted, that graduate faculties help their last-year students find work. The general attitude at the regional meetings, now one that most of us would find shocking, was that job-finding was the students' problem. The best of them, we kept telling ourselves, had jobs by the end of January, and the others managed somehow.

Taken as a whole, though, the recommendations that emerged from the 1967 study were salutary. The pipes *were* clogged and our graduate programs had not been adequately adjusted to the needs of the time or to the enormous increase in our subject matter. No, the real weaknesses in the 1967 study can be found not so much in what we *did* as in what we *did not* do. We found ways of speeding up the doctoral program, but we never asked ourselves if in its current form it were worth speeding up. We asked questions of efficiency, but not of validity. We assumed that our graduate programs, if a little inefficient, were basically sound. We failed, in short, to engage in an organized process of evaluation.

Our neglect in this regard can in part be explained. The demand for our products seemed to indicate that our procedures *were* valid. Hence to have thrown our doctoral work as a whole into question at a time when only more graduates seemed to be needed would have seemed an act of caprice, even folly—like tearing down the car when all it seems to need is an adjustment of the timer. Furthermore, it can be argued that some evaluation *did* take place. There was some discussion, for example, of the usefulness of foreign language examinations, of the comprehensive examinations, of the dissertation. The final oral drew so much fire that the study's recommendation was to throw it out.

Furthermore, certain items on the questionnaire elicited what by courtesy might be called evaluations. Through the responses to these, for example, we learned that the great majority of the chairmen and graduate professors placed high value on foreign language examinations—though most of them seldom read anything in the languages in which *they* were once examined, and though they

rarely gave assignments in foreign language texts. They also placed high value on the comprehensive examination—though 37% wanted to increase its scope, 45% to reduce its scope, and 6% to eliminate it altogether.

The responses of recent recipients of the degree were not much more illuminating. They indicated that a whopping 83% of the recent recipients believed that the examination had been valuable, that two-thirds of them looked back on the research for their dissertations as being "exciting and absorbing," and that 56% of them were even willing to treasure memories of their final oral. In ranking the various aspects of their programs in importance, however, they put their courses first, independent study second, and the dissertation third. Among their *complaints*, the language examinations were an easy winner, courses second, and the Old English requirement third. The comprehensive examination and the history of the language requirement finished just out of the money. It was comforting, of course, to receive the equivalent of at least a bronze medal from our former students. But as more than one cynic pointed out, asking those who had successfully completed the program whether they approved it was like asking millionaires whether they approve of the capitalistic system.

No, however much we may try, we cannot honestly conclude that the study of 1967 resulted in the kind of searching analysis or evaluation that would have made it a landmark in the history of the profession. We bandied about such words as "valuable" and "useful" without first agreeing on our standards for value and usefulness. We grounded our discussions in the immediate need for more college teachers, not in the continuing needs of society for information and perspective and vision.

Let me try to be more specific about these basic limitations of the 1967 study—not because I want to belabor the study unduly, but because reflections on its limitations may suggest opportunities for these meetings in Austin. In my opinion there were three major areas in which we especially failed in 1967 to scrutinize carefully enough our training of what we were pleased to call our "promising young scholar-teachers." One of these concerned their training as teachers; the other two, their training as scholars. By means of a short Socratic dialogue I should like to suggest a sample line of questioning in each area that might have been explored in the 1967 regional meetings but never was.

With respect to our obligation to develop capable college teachers we contented ourselves, as you already know, with recommending that there be limited but supervised teaching in the second and third years of a student's graduate study. There was no attempt to connect this training with the doctoral program as such. We never asked ourselves such primary questions as the following. My homemade Socrates speaks first.

Socr.: So you English professors believe that society needs many more college teachers of English?

Prof.: Yes, they are in great demand.

Socr.: And they get their formal training in your graduate programs?

Prof.: Yes.

Socr.: What do you train a Ph.D. candidate in English to teach?

Prof.: Primarily writing, English and American literature, and the English language.

Socr.: And how do you train him to teach these subjects?

Prof.: By helping him to learn the nature and history of English and American literature and a little about the nature and history of the language.

Socr.: You do not help the candidate to improve his writing and learn about the nature of writing?

Prof.: No. He was supposed to do those things when he was a freshman in college.

Socr.: But you do train this candidate to teach these three subjects though you ignore the theory and practice of one of them?

Prof.: Train him to teach? Well, not exactly. You see we rather assume that he will be able to teach after he has sat in our classes, and has taught several sections in our freshman program.

Socr.: Ah, so you senior professors of English join with these young candidates in teaching freshmen so that you can be sure that the candidates are excellently trained as teachers?

Prof.: No, of course not. We leave freshman English to a supervisor who seems to like that sort of thing. We think he is probably training our Ph.D. candidates quite well.

Socr.: But you don't *know* that he is from personal observation?

Prof.: No.

Socr.: So since you don't know that he is, you test these candidates on their ability to teach before granting them their degrees?

Prof.: No. As I said we sort of assume that...

Socr.: In short, you are maintaining that society should support you because you turn out teachers of writing and literature and language—but you neither help to train them to teach these subjects nor do you test them to see whether they can teach these subjects.

Prof.: Now look here. . .

Such a line of questioning, or something similar to it, was never part of the 1967 study. There never was any suggestion, in my hearing at least, that the preparation of our candidates as teachers might properly be integrated with their preparation as scholars, that the comprehensive examination might appropriately require the candidate to devise a model course, or deliver a lecture, or indicate the critical approaches that might be most promising in teaching, say, *Huckleberry Finn* to sophomores, or to lead a discussion of undergraduates. In short, we slid around almost everything that might have made the 1967 conferences historic for the teaching of college English.

We slid around almost everything that would have made it historic for *research* in English too. We never asked really searching questions about either the comprehensive examination or the dissertation. Such as these, for example, on the examination:

Socr.: So your Ph.D. in English plays a useful role in society as a scholar as well as a teacher.

Prof.: Yes.

Socr.: What does he do as a scholar?

Prof.: A great many things. He recovers lost information. He develops and evaluates evidence. He reasons carefully from tested premises to conclusions. He restores texts to the author's last intentions. He compiles reference works of all kinds. He uses a variety of critical approaches in interpreting and evaluating literary works. He writes critical biographies and literary histories.

Socr.: These all seem like difficult but valuable techniques. You train the Ph.D. candidate so that he develops each of these techniques?

Prof.: Yes.

Socr.: How do you train him?

Prof.: Principally, we have him take a variety of period and genre courses and seminars in English and American literature.

Socr.: And as a result of taking these courses he learns all of the techniques or skills you have just named?

Prof.: Well, we can't be sure, but he certainly gets exposed to many of them.

Socr.: But you can't be sure that all of your Ph.D. candidates learn all of these scholarly techniques through their courses and seminars?

Prof.: No.

Socr.: So to make sure that all of your candidates have developed these skills before you graduate them, you test their proficiency in what you call a preliminary or comprehensive examination?

Prof.: No. At least not altogether.

Socr.: This is surprising. What *do* you test the candidate for on this long examination?

Prof.: Primarily for his knowledge of English and American literature.

Socr.: His *knowledge* of these literatures? But you said that as a scholar he is useful because he can discover and evaluate evidence, restore texts to their author's last intentions, use a variety of critical approaches, and all those other skills you mentioned.

Prof.: Yes, but we're also interested in discovering the breadth and accuracy of his reading. In some departments we test him over as many as nine periods of English and American literature. We want to know whether he has read so well that he can recall facts about important works from *Beowulf* to *Herzog*.

Socr.: You test his recall because recall will be very important when he later writes articles and books for publication?

Prof.: Oh no. A scholar would be foolhardy to depend upon his memory when he is writing for publication.

Socr.: This is very confusing. You test the young scholar for a skill that he will not use but do not test him for all of the techniques or skills that he will use?

Prof.: Well, not quite. I said that we hope he'll develop most of these other skills in his classes and seminars.

Socr.: In short, then, you are telling me that society should support you because you train highly skilled scholars, but you are not sure that all of your Ph.D. candidates are trained in all of the scholarly skills and you test them only for a skill that, once graduated, they would be foolhardy to use.

Prof.: Now look here. . .

Overdrawn? Maybe. But I hope you will admit that it contains one line of questioning that any

rigorous study of our Ph.D. program is obligated to pursue. I heard literally no one at the 1967 meetings suggest that there might be something inconsistent in the nature of our examinations.

I now turn to the dissertation, and because of its particular relevance for these meetings I shall spend more time on it than I have on either teacher training or the comprehensive examinations.

As it did with other aspects of the doctoral program, the 1967 study, I am afraid, examined the dissertation primarily to see whether work on it could be speeded up without substantial loss in the training of the candidate. The questionnaire contained ten items on the dissertation, almost all of them directed to recent recipients of the degree—and almost all of them inconsequential except as they revealed inefficient use of time. The items dealt with the length of the dissertation, the reasons for selecting the area, the source for the specific subjects, the relative success with the first subject selected, assistance given by directors, and in retrospect the attitude toward the research required. Department chairmen, graduate professors, and recent recipients were all asked for their attitudes toward substitutions for the traditional dissertation. Only the graduate professors were permitted a judgment involving the quality of the dissertation itself. How did they evaluate the dissertations they had recently read? In their answers, as Don Cameron Allen observed, they "more or less rushed to the safety of the middle." They remembered about 10% as being substantial contributions to scholarship and criticism, slightly less than 10% as being of no value, and all of the others as being merely so-so. From the questionnaires and the regional discussions two recommendations emerged: one, that the dissertation should be of such scope that it could be completed within twelve months of full-time study; and two, that it might be either a monograph or a group of related essays.

The failure to tackle the problem of the quality or significance of the scholarship we sponsor in our graduate programs was, as I look back on it now, one of the greatest disappointments of the 1967 study. It is a failure that is hard to account for, too, since standards for scholarship were an issue then, job shortage or no job shortage.

If for no other reason, it was an issue because standards were becoming more and more uncertain as the historically oriented dissertation gave way to critical studies. The expression "contribution to knowledge" served well as a criterion of excellence—and still does—for the paper reporting lost or forgotten or overlooked historical facts, tendencies, influences, and the like. But such subjects were drying up in 1967, they're in shorter supply today, and may be almost extinct after ten more years and at least ten thousand more dissertations. There is only so much to be learned about Shakespeare's quartos, Melville's antics in the South Seas, and Emerson's debt to Carlyle. How completely students are having to scrounge for topics in areas other than literary history became evident to me again this past fall. Of the first sixty letters of application I received, seven reported dissertation topics clearly in the area of literary history, two were in linguistics, three in editing, four in interdisciplinary areas, and forty-four in literary criticism of one kind or another. Can all of these be considered "contributions to knowledge"? Since the term is disappearing from our catalogues there must be some silent agreement among us that they cannot. What, then, *are* our criteria for excellence? Is ingenuity enough? (A demonstration, for example, that all of the important events in *The Ambassadors* occur on Christian holidays.) Is any new interpretation enough? (An argument, for example, that Mark Twain's best work began in 1897 with *Following the Equator*.) Is a gesture toward the interdisciplinary enough? (A Freudian interpretation of three Shakespearean plays, for example, by a student who knows Freud only by the popular cliches.)

If it was unfortunate that we did not consider in detail the quality of our dissertations in 1967, it was even more unfortunate, it seems to me, that we did not raise the issue of the purpose or validity of the dissertation. Is its basic purpose to train graduate students in scholarly techniques? Not primarily, since they can learn those through seminar papers. Is it to train graduate students to prepare and write a book-length study? Apparently not. Even in 1967 we felt that a group of related essays might serve instead of a monograph. Is its purpose to add to knowledge or understanding? If so, whose knowledge or whose understanding? Whom is the candidate addressing in this tedious effort that leaves his face ashen and his hair gray before its time?

Are we training the student to write in a vacuum? If so, we are destroying his hope of usefulness, his pride in himself as a responsible human being. Are we training him to write for us? If so, we are more self-serving and presumptuous than our worst critics claim that we are. Are we training him to write for scholars present and scholars future? If so, we are encouraging an elitism that society may not be willing to tolerate indefinitely. Or should we be training the graduate student to write for the public at large as well as

for his committee and others in his field? The idea is intriguing. A sense for this larger audience might give the student a greater feeling of purpose, it would link our activities with public concerns, and it might even result in considerably better writing.

Let me pursue this subject of our relation with the public a bit further. Even in 1967, despite the demand for our graduates, we were not the public's darlings. They tolerated us not because we are teachers and scholars of literature but because they thought we taught clear and useful writing. They still do. You know what happens when you are introduced as a professor of English. Someone invariably remarks that he'll have to watch his grammar. Who ever asks what is new in Victorian literature, or how your work on Traherne is coming along, or even what research you're engaged in? At the last meeting of the MMLA, Bill Schaefer put it even more devastatingly. "It is not a matter of our having a bad image or an inaccurate image," he said; "the problem is that at present we do not even make a reflection. . . .How can we talk about, much less meet, our obligations to society when society barely knows we exist?" There is only one statement in the whole Allen report that bears on our relations to society as a whole. It goes this way: "Can the curriculum for the doctorate in English be shorn of its unrealistic accretions and concerted into a serviceable and uniformly administered procedure sensibly adjusted in all its requirements to the public obligations of the profession of this century?" That is all. It should have been the heart of the entire study.

To the same MMLA meeting Mrs. Dolores Minor, assistant to the superintendent of the Detroit public school system, sent a paper in which she argued impressively that what concerns society most deeply today is its own survival. It supports what it believes will help it to survive; it will cut off support from what it thinks will not help it to survive. We can talk unendingly among ourselves about our concern for "the eternal verities" or "literature as the criticism of life" or "the universal and omnipresent need for humane letters," but unless we can translate these cliches into something that society feels is important for its survival—or at least the quality of that survival—we may well forfeit society's support. There are ominous signs that this may be happening.

Note that the Congress recently created an Office of Technological Assessment to act as a watchdog on scientific research. Note that the Office of Education no longer supports research in literature. Note how increasingly careful the NEH has become with respect to the projects it supports. Note how many of us in state universities have had to justify ourselves as teachers before we can receive allocations for research leaves. Note the demand for behavioral objectives now creeping upward to the college level. Note the new emphasis on accountability with its attendant emphasis on quantification. Note how the center for decision-making is moving outside the university to unions, legislatures, and educational commissions. Note the drop in the last six years in public confidence in our educational leaders from 61% to 33%. Note the continuing antipathy for the college professor, especially a professor in the humanities, as a fat cat hiding behind his cloak of tenure and sacrificing his students for the sake of his articles and books. A colleague of mine, recently attending a meeting of parents of Iowa undergraduates in Ottumwa, came away unnerved by the attacks on the university. Those parents only partially knew what we are about, and what they knew they didn't like. Yet Iowa in the past has been generous to higher education.

Now, I'm not here primarily to deliver a jeremiad. And I don't think that our profession is going down the drain tomorrow. But I do think that over the long haul ahead there is a real threat to our future as scholars, and maybe even as teachers, unless we can more explicitly relate our activities to society's basic concerns for the nature and quality of its survival. Scientists have understood the need to do this. That is why they write not only for their scientific journals but also for *Science*, *Scientific American*, *Psychology Today*, and a variety of other journals published for laymen. Bill Schaefer's idea of a journal for laymen in *our* field can't be too strongly supported. But the thousands of dissertations being produced every year offer an even more promising means of relating to the public upon whom we depend. Why shouldn't we encourage our students to write not only for their peers but also for laymen? Why shouldn't they be encouraged, maybe even required, to write up aspects of their work for the Sunday New York *Times* or the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* or any other responsible publication read by laymen? If only a small proportion of their efforts get published, the public would at least to that extent be better informed of who we are and what we're doing. Moreover, nothing, I submit, would be more likely to discourage a student from writing a trivial dissertation than the threat of having to submit part of it to the public.

Again, I let my poor-man's Socrates take over. But this will be the last time because, as you will see, he is beginning to get out of hand.

Socr.: So you consider the dissertation as the capstone of your doctoral program?

Prof.: Yes.

Socr.: And you spend much of your time directing students who are writing dissertations?

Prof.: Yes.

Socr.: And you do this because you think the time is usefully spent?

Prof.: Yes.

Socr.: How many of your students engage in important scholarship after they receive their doctorates?

Prof.: Almost all of them get something published.

Socr.: No. You misunderstand me. How many of them will become really productive scholars, producing, that is, one or two books beyond their disserations?

Prof.: Well, if you put it that way, maybe about ten percent.

Socr.: Ten percent! And you spend all of this time and effort on dissertations though ninety percent of your graduates will not be really productive scholars. Why do you continue this strange madness?

Prof.: Because the Ph.D. wouldn't be a scholarly degree if there weren't a dissertation.

Socr.: But how can it be a scholarly degree if ninety per cent of those who hold it are not productive scholars? Did you ever think of allowing it to relate when desirable to what the ninety percent presumably *will* do, namely teaching?

Prof.: No, we're not interested in pedagogy. That's for Colleges of Education. Besides, the dissertation as it is is a good exercise; it trains the mind; it gives the candidate an appreciation of his discipline.

Socr.: Ah, you have evidence for these splendid assertions?

Prof.: No. We think they're all self-evident.

Socr.: The color in your face tells me that you know that they are not self-evident. But let us assume that in your headstrong way you will continue to force this huge exercise on students, most of whom will never indulge in such an exercise again. If the dissertation is not to be of any proven use to the *writer*, what contribution will it make to the *general good*?

Prof.: I don't understand.

Socr.: To what use is a dissertation put?

Prof.: Well, other scholars may refer to it once in a while. Sometimes some of the findings are used in class lectures. If the man's lucky he will get some of it printed in scholarly journals and university press books.

Socr.: And who will read these journals and books?

Prof.: Other scholars mostly.

Socr.: All other scholars?

Prof.: No. Just some of those in the same field.

Socr.: This is unbelievable. You are telling me that you spend all of this time training the young scholar to write a dissertation just so that if he's lucky, he'll get something printed for other scholars in the field?

Prof.: More or less, yes.

Socr.: And you don't care whether or not he shares his discoveries and insights, such as they are, with society at large? I would think that *he* would want to feel that he is doing something for the general good.

Prof.: Society at large doesn't care about what he is doing, and probably wouldn't understand.

Socr.: Have you ever tried to see whether they would care or understand?

Prof.: Not really. They're a bunch of philistines.

Socr.: But you expect this bunch of philistines, as you call them, to pay your salary for training scholars who will ignore them and add nothing, so far as they know, to the nature and quality of their lives?

Prof.: Now see here!

I hope that the main thrust of these remarks is clear. I am urging that we test every aspect of our doctoral programs for its validity, including such time-honored features as the comprehensive examination and the dissertation. I am *not* arguing that training in research is largely beside the point for the majority of our doctoral candidates. On the contrary, I believe that such training needs to be sharpened and extended. It should be training in *research*, though, and not in memorizing. It should be training for teaching as well as publication. Better than we do now, we should undertake to persuade our doctoral candidates that research is at the heart of *everything* they will do professionally. They should leave our halls convinced that careful research is prerequisite not only to the historical and critical essay but also to the well-constructed course, the classroom lecture or discussion, and statements for the general public. Research, in short, is to be their continuing business, though the results of it may and should take many forms for many audiences.

I have wandered from the 1967 study, but only to indicate that many of the primary questions and issues were not raised at that time. Within a narrow range and for its own day, the study was a useful undertaking. There is no mistake about that. But its day was brief, and its full usefulness, therefore, short-lived. Much remains to be done.

THE MYTH OF RELEVANCY AND THE TRADITIONAL DISCIPLINES

Bernard Weinberg
University of Chicago

THEY TELL ME that relevancy is a dead horse; I shall therefore not have to beat it to death.

While relevancy was still alive—and it must have been until quite recently—its signal service to our profession was to challenge the origins, the legitimacy, the procedures, and the usefulness of the traditional disciplines in literary scholarship. The general thesis of the Relevantines, whose attention was directed exclusively to the literature, the culture, and the problems of our own time, was that any complex of activities bearing upon the past and using methods coming out of the past must necessarily be discouraged, if not abandoned. As a secondary thesis, they held that contemporary concerns were in their nature so different from any of those with which the intellectual community had previously contended that only new and revolutionary disciplines could provide solutions.

I say "signal service" without irony, without bitterness, surely without contempt. For throughout the profession we needed the challenge to our complacency about what we were doing and how we were doing it; we needed the jolt—and it was a jolt—that would make us ask of ourselves many questions that we should have asked long since. Something like a century had gone by since the profession began developing the scholarly techniques that were to be its way to knowledge and understanding. We were certain that, in our time, those techniques had reached a point of perfection never before attained. I think that we were probably right about that. But we also assumed, carelessly and comfortably, that because the state of knowledge had reached an apex, each one of us, in his personal departmental activity, was performing at the very top of the professional potential. I think that we may have been wrong about that. When methods become departmentalized, institutionalized, democratized, programmed, the dream of perfection tends to become lost or obscured; and as the decades slip by, the rationale and the justification lose their force and are replaced by tired habits and unthinking routines.

I shall be speaking today about the nature of the traditional disciplines of literary scholarship, about their present status in the profession, about their usefulness in both old and new fields of study, and about the ways in which they can best obtain their proper emphasis in the Ph.D. program in literature.

I suppose that I should say first what I mean by the "traditional disciplines." Naturally, they fall into two categories: the disciplines of literary history and the disciplines of literary criticism. By the disciplines of literary history I designate all those methods and forms of knowledge which give us the texts we want to read, the languages we need to read them, the explanations of historical backgrounds and allusions, insights into literary conventions and forms—in a word, the procedures by which we bring a text to a level of proper comprehensibility for the modern reader. In the disciplines of literary criticism I include all those ways of reading literary texts as works of literary art with a view to understanding them fully and appropriately, to evaluating and judging their artistic merit.

Fortunately for us all (and this is almost exclusively a contribution of the English and American schools of literary study), both literary criticism and literary history are now considered legitimate branches of "research" both in a Ph.D. program and in a scholarly career. This was not always the case. If literary criticism has recently gained its *droit de cité*, it is because we have raised it to the level and the dignity of a

discipline—traditional or no. We have insisted (and I include in the "we" a variety of schools and tendencies) that criticism have its firm philosophical bases, its proper methods, its techniques of reading and judgment; we have wished, in a word, that it should substitute discipline for impressionism, reason for the instinctive response, analysis and organized discourse for the *obiter dictum*.

In a strange but perfectly understandable way, literary criticism in our times was an outgrowth of our concern with literary history. As we pursued the historical inquiry, we asked increasingly: "But why all this attention to texts, why all this labor over allusions and references, why this search for the tradition and the convention?" The answer: "The better to understand the work." It was obvious that the answer was ambiguous, if not unsatisfactory. For "understanding" on a purely historical basis was not what many historical scholars wanted; they wanted, besides, the kind of understanding that might lead to an enhanced enjoyment of works and ability to judge and evaluate them. Thus they needed to develop another branch of humanistic inquiry—we may tentatively call it aesthetics—which would enable them to move from historical into critical techniques, into the areas of "reading," "discovery," and "appreciation."

I emphasize the close affiliation between literary history and literary criticism because I wish to stress one essential fact: both are fundamentally "literary" (having to do with letters) and both are fundamentally humanistic (using the arts and the methods of the humanities). In this sense, both belong to the central tradition of studies in literature and the related humanistic areas. They are thus our business. We can do them better than anybody else; and it may be that nobody else can do them at all. They are what we "profess," and we are true professionals when we practice them with maximum competency.

Those who worship relevancy would have us do other things—things for which we are ill equipped (if at all) and in which we can at best achieve amateur status. Let me put it this way: although we are not told to what relevant things are relevant, the implicit supposition is that they are relevant to the problems and preoccupations of our own times, to what one of my colleagues calls the "intellectual needs" of our children, to what would seem to be the social needs of the man in the twentieth-century street. Since this relevancy is essentially a social or societal one, several corollary suppositions follow: that any object of study dating from an earlier century is useless and uninteresting (unless we can find in it a miraculous prophecy of our times); that any mode of study which does not employ the methods and techniques of the social sciences is vain and misguided; that any conclusions which do not contribute immediately to the improvement of the human condition had best be left unconcluded. We in the literary profession should therefore study only the most contemporary of contemporary literary documents; we should use only the approaches of psychiatry, anthropology, economics, and politics; and we should seek the answer to only one question: "How does this work reveal our society, represent our society, improve our society?"

I admit the interest and the importance of this question (which is really three questions); I admit the appropriateness of these approaches for professionals in the sciences named who wish, in their investigations, to add the documents of literature to the documents of life; I even admit that there is a place, within literary study itself, for the study of twentieth-century literature. But I resist the implication that these are the questions and these the methods with which the literary scholar should be exclusively or even primarily concerned, and the further demand that all times prior to our own, along with their works, should be abandoned and vilified.

In the same way, I should insist—and this time positively—that the "traditional disciplines" of literary scholarship, those which have always been our very own, are as essential to qualified work on modern texts as they are to the study of the ancient and "irrelevant" masterpieces. They *are* disciplines—and by a discipline I mean a body of rules or methods with which one operates upon the subject materials; their beauty as such is that they may be applied universally to their specific objects, without distinction of time and place, and with only such modifications as the changing habits of writing and transmitting texts might demand. It is for this reason that they should have and must have their place in the training of the doctoral candidate; without them he cannot hope to realize a fully satisfying career as a practicing scholar on the highest professional level.

The most ancient and revered of the disciplines used in literary scholarship is the one that used to be known, and may still be known, as "philology"; it goes back at least as far as the humanistic period. At that time, at the beginnings of the modern scholarly enterprise, the philologist needed to resolve questions of language and text in order to give the world proper first editions of the Greek and Latin classics. Johannes Lascaris did so in his *princeps* of Aristotle's *Poetics*, apparently in a brilliant way. We tend now to think of this as a

procedure most useful for early texts, the *Song of Roland* or Chaucer. We practice it, however, when we work on *Finnegan's Wake* or on Ezra Pound's *Cantos*. Textual criticism is a related art; it aims to give us, for a given work, the best possible edition derived from all available manuscripts or printed books. Again, the humanists worked hard and well at it; early in the eighteenth century, LeDuchat produced his critical edition of Rabelais; and since then a legion of scholars has refined the pertinent techniques to a point where we now have first-rate editions of many, many texts. We do not have them, strangely enough, for some of the greatest of modern writers: for Proust, for Rimbaud and Mallarmé, maybe even for Baudelaire.

Paleography and codicology, if only because of their barbarous-sounding names, would seem to send us back to those barbarous times when old men wrote old "hands" on vellum or parchment. Indeed, the two disciplines developed in connection with the study of the earliest medieval manuscripts of the ancient classical texts; the modern literary scholar began to apply them to the earliest documents of the modern literatures. I should like to suggest that training in handwriting and in the physical analysis of manuscripts, while it may well take place in the medieval seminar, may prove to be indispensable for Balzac's much-revised proof sheets, for the little bundles of scraps of paper that contain Pascal's *Pensées*, for Melville's novels, for Proust's correspondence. The related art of descriptive bibliography (or the study of the physical characteristics of the printed book) has been practiced exclusively in the Anglo-Saxon countries. It was used originally on the editions of Shakespeare and other early writers, but is now applied increasingly to English and American works of other periods; it needs desperately to be practiced in all the other modern literatures. I imagine that such study, brought to bear on the primary editions of *A la recherche du temps perdu*, might clarify our information about the publication of the work and might enable us to work, at long last, toward a proper critical text.

When we move away from manuscripts and editions and into the central problem of the texts they contain, we find again that there are a number of historical disciplines whose initial use was related to the first centuries of the modern literatures but which might well be exploited even for contemporary works. A good example would be the study of literary conventions, one which has ranged, in former times, from the conventions of formulaic repetition in the *Poema de mio Cid*, to the conventions of the *tenzone* in the poetry of the *dolce stil nuovo*, to those of organization in seventeenth century French drama, to those of the French sonnet down through the nineteenth century. Since even the most "unconventional" of literary pieces grows out of recognized traditions, should we not investigate the possibility that such works as Beckett's *Waiting for Godot* and Camus's *La Peste* might be illuminated through an understanding of the conventions from which they spring? We have all learned a great deal, along another line, by clarifying historical allusions and historical backgrounds for such masterpieces as *La Princesse de Cleves* and *King Lear*. Why should not the same kind of clarification result from a similar study of much of Apollinaire's poetry, based as it is in recent history and current social forms? Or of many of Baudelaire's poems, alluding as they do to historical events that he found useful for the building of the passion or the argument? We have all learned to read Joyce's *Ulysses* as a complex allusion to Homer's *Odyssey*, and in so doing we have learned how to read Joyce's *Ulysses*. It might be equally instructive for us to pursue the literary allusions that have given substance and sense to so many other modern works.

I mean to insist, in sum, that the various disciplinary orientations of literary scholarship, regardless of the specific matters or periods with which they may originally have been associated, have that kind of wide-ranging applicability which is inherent in all disciplines. The fact that we have ourselves learned them in a course on *Beowulf* or on the *Nibelungenlied* does not mean that we cannot use them on other works, no matter how distant in time or space. From this circumstance we may derive a lesson for our teaching and for our planning in the Ph.D. program. Whatever the stated subject matter of a course, we will make it more universally and more permanently useful to the student if we emphasize the disciplines involved in the study of the materials rather than the materials themselves. We never know, and the student never knows, into what areas a career in research may lead him. We must provide him with the disciplines that he will need wherever he goes. If we do so, we will have given him an education.

An orientation of our programs toward the disciplines rather than toward the subjects is demanded in an even more urgent way in the teaching of critical approaches to literature. For there is no proper "reading" without firm techniques of reading, and there is no proper "criticism" without principles of criticism. Techniques and principles, moreover, are even harder for the student to acquire than are the historical disciplines of which I have been speaking. There are many manuals that he may consult on paleogra-

phy or historical method; there are few places to which he can go to learn the steps and the procedures for reading a given poem in a given mode. Reading in this sense is a habit, acquired over long periods of time and necessitating considerable help from the teacher. Research in reading and criticism—just like that in historical scholarship—consists in the acquisition of educated habits and in the application of those habits to particular texts. (It should be apparent that I do not limit the term "research" to the piling up and the filling in of innumerable factual *fiches*.) The main difference between the two is that research of a historical nature requires a certain number of mechanical or material operations, whereas critical research is purely intellectual—and therefore even more difficult.

The reading of poetic texts is a consecrated discipline that goes back almost as far as literature itself. The Greeks and the Alexandrians and the Romans practiced it; the medieval scholiast and the Renaissance humanist practiced it; the neoclassical aristarch and the nineteenth century critic practiced it. But each of these, in his time, read and evaluated poems in a distinct way, working in the traditions on which he had been raised. When Donatus read Terence's comedies, he sought to classify each comedy according to type, to clarify the plot and the characters, to derive the appropriate moral *sententiae*, above all to give a full philological commentary. Voltaire, when he read Corneille, remarked on the degree to which the observance of the rules made an individual tragedy "regular," he applied his criteria of verisimilitude and interest, and most of all he chastised the grammar, syntax, and usage of the poet. When Balzac reads Stendhal's *Chartreuse de Parme*, he gives, along with an endless summary, his opinions on the lack of unity in the work, on the excellence of the portraits (some of which resemble contemporary figures), on the accuracy of Stendhal's representation of the Italian character and of Italian life; he adds the customary strictures on the weaknesses in the style. Each one of these readings presupposes an aesthetic position (however rudimentary), a method of analysis, and a method of presentation.

There are several ways in which the traditon of practical literary criticism may be made to help form the critical habits of our students. If we read with them the readings of Donatus or Voltaire or Balzac, insisting that they themselves discover what the aesthetic presuppositions were, how the analysis was made and presented, we will not only exercise them in the art of reading criticism, we will also bring to their awareness a certain number of critical modes or possibilities. As such readings multiply, the student will gradually fill in his notions about what kinds of criticism have been practiced (and therefore may be practiced), about the groups or types into which they fall, about the powers and the limitations of each type. If, then, we associate the reading of "readings" with the reading of the original poetic works to which they refer, we may discover with the student which aspects of each work were properly emphasized, which neglected by the critic. We may initiate him, in a word, into the disciplines of the reading of criticism and the reading of works.

Neither of these procedures will be successfully taught, however, unless accompanied by an induction into poetic theory itself. For since the reading of "readings" and the reading of texts depends upon the asking of appropriate questions, it will be random and uneconomical unless those questions spring from a theory of literary art. I fear that the theory of literature (or poetic theory) has not been a traditional discipline in our Ph.D. programs; but I am convinced that it may be derived, at least in part, from forms of teaching that have long been honored among us. Courses in the history of criticism have been offered for several generations, and at their best they have led to philosophical statements about the various theoretical modes. We might well regard the great theoretical statements, from Plato to Maritain, not merely as museum pieces or as historical monuments, but as exemplars of the many ways in which man has conceived of the art of poetry and of the possibilities for reading, understanding, and judging the work of art.

But even this elevation of historical pieces to the dignity of forms will not be sufficient. Somewhere along the line, at some point in our teaching and in the student's learning, there must be a place for serious thinking of our own about the aesthetics of poetry—about aesthetics in general. Aesthetics has been, for centuries, a traditional branch of learning, but it has belonged to the philosophers rather than to the literati. They have seen it in the context of the other philosophical disciplines to which it is related; we must bring it into relationship with the particular art that we expound and the works in that art which we teach. We must, that is, start with general aesthetics, then move to poetic theory, then to the applications of poetic theory to the analysis of individual works. Once we have done so, the questions that we ask about the work will be firmly based in our conception of the art; the answers they bring will lead to a more correct understanding and a more just evaluation of the

work. Indeed, the better we become at asking aesthetic questions about the poem, the more properly will we ask historical questions that will bring us important information relevant to the understanding of the work as a work of art. Criticism will teach history how to do those things that will serve as a preparation for the functioning of criticism.

Our alliances with history and with philosophy, with those of their traditional disciplines that are the most apposite to our own special techniques, are the proper ones for us to make. Our business is criticism ultimately, literary history in an intermediate way. If they work together properly in our research and our teaching, we shall give our students a rich understanding of literary works; in their turn, they will become good teachers and good research scholars. If we do not make criticism and history work together properly, their place will be taken—in the minds of our students—by the non-humanistic disciplines of anthropology, sociology, political science, psychiatry, or by propaganda pressures of all colors that would divert us to their own uses. Our own disciplines, historical and critical, should form in the student the conviction that his professional goals and his professional methods are broadly humanistic (whether literary or linguistic) and that excellence in the practice of those disciplines will assure him a satisfying professional career.

It is one thing to have a firm professional ideal and a clear conception of what our professional disciplines should be; it is another to transform them both into the stuff of a practical Ph.D. program. The individual professor may sometimes do so better than the department; the ideal especially is a very personal thing. Should the ideal be lacking, the lone professor may find guidance and encouragement among his colleagues in the department. But should the department be adrift, uncertain both about its ideals and its disciplines, whence will come the inspiration and the practical wisdom that will invent and realize an effective program? I posit, of course, an extreme case; in almost every literary department that I know there are some members possessed of a high professional ideal and a strong will to accomplish it. But I do not think that I posit an impossible case; and by imagining its existence, I may be able to suggest remedies and preventatives that might be useful even for the moderately effective department.

My first suggestion of a means for insuring due regard for the traditional disciplines concerns the making of the departmental program itself: it should be based on a disciplinary rather than a chronological prejudice. In a time when departments are becoming smaller rather than larger, when students are insisting on methods and techniques rather than on information, we must alter our notion of "coverage" or "spread." We must cover not every author, period, or genre in a given literature—that is impossible, anyway—but all the disciplines useful for the study of that literature. I am not disparaging information or wide-ranging reading, both fundamental parts of a student's education; but I am convinced that they can be done—perhaps should be done—on the initiative of the student on the basis of an individual program that he himself lays out. We may well, if we wish, test his information and his reading; we should not have to direct, supervise, or teach them. Instead, we should spend our precious teaching time in doing for the student what he cannot do for himself: presenting the theory and the modes of practical application of our essential disciplines, both historical and critical. I am sure that many, perhaps all of us do this in separate courses. But how many of us, as we plan our departmental programs, stop to ask whether those programs "cover" properly the scholarly disciplines? Does something different happen—in a "disciplinary" way—in the course on Jane Austen than in the course on *Moby Dick*? Does the course on bibliography do anything that was not done in the bibliographical introduction to the study of the eighteenth century English novel?

What I am hoping, in effect, is that a program for the Ph.D. will be much more than a collection of courses representing the specialties of the professors teaching it; that it will include, on the one hand, theoretical courses for each of the major disciplines—descriptive bibliography, for example—with exercises exemplifying them, and, on the other hand, practical or "subject matter" courses in which the theories will be applied (as they always must be) to specific authors or works or periods or movements. I can conceive of a small department of Romance Languages (my own, for example) in which studies in the French, Italian and Spanish Renaissance might be strong; in which the historical disciplines of paleography, descriptive bibliography, and textual criticism might be presented theoretically either within the department or elsewhere in the university; and in which a number of monographic courses—Rabelais, sixteenth century Italian drama, the poetry of Luis de Leon—might wittingly provide the occasion for use of the theory on practical problems. I can also imagine a completely "relevant" department of English in which all the work might be done in twentieth century American literature and in

which, nevertheless, the division between theoretical and practical courses might be made.

I realize that while such an organization is highly feasible for the historical disciplines, it would present many difficulties for the critical disciplines. Criticism of whatever brand is a completely personal affair; no self-respecting critic would want anybody else to teach his theory, nor would he consent to apply another's aesthetics in his own study of works. In this area, the individual professor will have to be both theorist and practitioner. Moreover, if the making of a program may be a departmental matter, the making of a course is always a private matter—especially if the course is critical and analytical in nature. That is the ideal situation. For nothing is worse for the department and the student than the imposition of critical dogma, than the attempt to create and establish a monolithic critical approach. Nothing is better for the student than the excitement, the confusion, and the doubt that arise when he has to compare, differentiate, and evaluate the distinctive critical positions of his various professors.

There are always some professors, I suppose, who regard any programming on the part of their colleagues as an infringement on their personal rights. They are mistaken if they think so; or at best they are lacking in a proper conception of the very basis on which an American graduate department operates. Since traditionally an American university, and with it each of its graduate departments, is organized in a way to produce the best possible graduate education for its students, it must expect that each professor will contribute to the cooperative educational enterprise. He will do so by teaching his own courses in his own way, of course; but as he plans and executes them, he must be concerned for the way in which they fit into the departmental program, for what he can add to the methods and the approaches of the others, for repetitions and deficiencies. As he thinks of the disciplines, historical and critical, he must constantly ask whether he himself is clear about the particular kind of "disciplinary" training that the student will get in each of his courses; whether it will be clear to the student; whether the kinds of exercises that he invents—reports, discussions, papers, problems—will demand the right kind of "habit-forming" participation from the student; whether he himself occupies a proper proportion of the class time, leaving the rest to the student for the kind of "doing" that makes for "learning."

The disciplines are habits. The Ph.D. candidate will form the ones that he needs to form only if he is put to work on the kinds of problems that he will later have to solve in his professional career. He will form them in an orderly and organized fashion only if the whole department and the single professor give him the opportunity to do so. Programs and courses. Moreover, department and professor have a responsibility to set a high standard of excellence, to serve as model and goal for the student. The standard should be clear and striking in the whole program, in each course, in every problem or project, at every moment of the student's contact with the department.

One of the ways of setting the standard is the departmental examinations required of the student, whether they be called generals or comprehensives or preliminaries. I realize that in recent times there have been some less-than-responsible students who have demanded the abolition of such examinations (presumably because they were old-fashioned ways of distinguishing merit) and that some less-than-responsible departments have yielded to the demand. To do so is not only to desert a tradition—that in itself would not be immediately damnable—but it is primarily to deprive oneself of one of the most powerful devices for structuring a student's education. Some examinations are obviously not for saving: I think, in my own field, of the kind that requires the student, once again, to rush through all the available manuals in order to review, once again, the whole of French literature. Examinations of that kind apparently still exist. We should not worry about them. We might direct our attention, instead, to the ends that should ideally be declared for Ph.D. examinations and the methods to be used for achieving them.

One end may be clear from what I have been saying: these examinations will best integrate the program if they, too, are oriented toward the disciplines. I think of the seminar report or the course paper as displaying certain techniques and procedures that cannot readily be examined, of the examination as involving the rest. For the disciplines, this means that much historical material is best prepared at home or in the library, where documents and books and time are available. Critical material, contrariwise, may properly supply the content for examinations. If the student has read, carefully and analytically, a limited body of works, he should be able to answer any critical questions about them. (Again, the asking of the questions will be a delicate matter. Dogma? Variant critical approaches? Professorial rivalries? I know that ways can be found.) As a second end, the examination might well seek a mixture of matters studied in class, in the official program, and of works read and meditated upon on the

student's own.

The single most effective device for perfecting, sharpening, and applying the disciplines is obviously the doctoral dissertation. That is why we have it and that is why we must keep it. If we are really serious about the Ph.D. as a research degree, then we must give the most serious consideration possible to the nature and the excellence of the doctoral thesis. We do not always do so: I am sure of this from the reading of many dissertations defended or even published in recent years, at a number of universities. I should like to suggest some guidelines for insuring the quality of dissertations. In the first place, every dissertation should be a departmental, not an individual, matter; that is, the proposal should be examined, appraised, and approved by the whole graduate faculty of the department. There should be no hesitation about calling into question the usefulness or the feasibility of the topic, even if the proposed director is a distinguished member of the department. Secondly, there should always be a committee of three readers for each dissertation willing to accept responsibility for following the work through outline by outline, chapter by chapter, page by page. This is the only way of assuring maximum fairness to the student. Thirdly, department and directors together should ask one fundamental question about any proposal—and demand an affirmative answer: Is the level of disciplined intellection required by the topic really sufficiently high for the crucial exercise of the Ph.D. program? Such a criterion will exclude the purely mechanical piece, the impressionistic divagation, the adventure into tempting areas where the candidate has no professional background. Lastly, the department should exert severe control over the size of the project: the time, the amount of material, the foreseeable length.

This is my program for the Ph.D. program. It concerns, clearly, primarily the research component—all those elements that should prepare the candidate for his career as a research scholar. It assumes that in order to operate on a high professional level the scholar must possess an art, and that the possession of his art will be a consequence of his training in the traditional disciplines, both historical and critical. It assumes, furthermore, that the art so possessed will qualify him to solve problems in any area of his literature, wherever whim, accident, or the pure passion for scholarship may lead him. If they lead him into the realm of the relevant, well and good. If they lead him, instead, back into the living and lively past, he may find that it too has its relevancy for himself and for the rest of us.

TRANSLATION AND TRANSFORMATION: NEW ROLES FOR RESEARCH

John W. Kneller
Brooklyn College, CUNY

Où suis-je? quel nouveau miracle
tient encor mes sens enchantés?
Quel vaste, quel pompeux spectacle
Frappe mes yeux épouvantés?
Un nouveau monde vient d'éclore:
L'univers se reform encore
dans les abîmes du chaos:
et pour réparer ses ruines,
je vois des demeures divines
descendre un peuple de héros. . .

Jean-Baptiste Rousseau, *Ode sur la Naissance de Monseigneur le Duc de Bretagne* (extrait), 1707

FRENCH is my language by choice; my experience translates itself into French and is transformed by the added possibilities of communication which that very responsive language offers. So I begin with a quotation which expresses a little of the vast wonder—and *beau désordre*—which accompanies the presidency of a large urban college. I do so to illustrate that one person's communicative instrument is another person's blank stare.

This is certainly no great discovery of mine; I wonder if there is a teacher alive who has never been carried away on the airy and brilliant transports of rhetoric, only to realize with dreadful certainty that the sea of students' faces beyond is tolerant, bored, sleepy, impatient—anything but rippled by a new idea, an understanding, a

communicative excitement. We talk to ourselves, if we are not constantly aware of language as a bridge—and a barrier.

The human race, from pole to pole and from the beginning of history to the present, has been physically differentiated by a number of biological characteristics, which are important to anthropologists but probably less so to linguists. The other differences, I would argue, are cultural. When one roams through the life of the world, stopping to look at an Albanian shepherd, a medieval page, an Eskimo hunter, a kabuki dancer, a television comedian, a Victorian poet, a bushwoman, a computer programmer, a Viking—it is astounding to realize the drastic and rich variations of cultures. And I can think of no facet of culture more important than language; without it people would have no way of sharing their sameness and and explaining their differences, which is so basic a need that many who cannot fulfill it go mad or simply sicken and die. Isolation is the cruellest punishment most prisons can devise.

I do not mean to imply that the ability to speak together ensures communication. Obviously, it does not. There is a pithy little saying which appears on office walls: "I know you think you understand what you believe I said, but I'm not sure you realize that what you heard is not what I meant." That goes for families who have lived together for decades; for colleagues who have shared monographs and coffee for years. To put it another way, people who share the same language, often do not. When we consider that the individual's definition of every word is built on the particular experiences and associations of one unique lifetime, it is amazing that language serves as a communicative tool at all. Add to that the importance language assumes in the minds of some, and the minor part it plays to others. There is the love of literature; there is the need to understand traffic signs; there is the desire to explain oneself; there is the will to find out how to do, to learn things.

Most parents acquire a new verbal consciousness and begin by telling their babies the names of things, ordering the universe in neat terms of dog and cat and cow, finger and toe and nose. But according to their own taboos, there are things to which they give no words, from parts of the body to parts of the soul. In later life those omissions become obscenity and profanity; they can become the way by which the inability to express need and emotion is made known. And this is only one example of the chasms of language.

Jargon is another. We are all familiar with the sensation of being turned away from an idea by a word we do not understand; most of us have the motivation to ask for definitions or look them up if our feeling for what we are missing is sufficiently strong. But then, our *field* is language. Linguists should know, better than anyone else, perhaps, how language can be used as a barrier behind which self-importance, self-aggrandizement proceeds. The deliberate attempt to obfuscate is a phenomenon found in nearly every profession which requires specialized education; I personally believe that no small measure of popular antipathy towards scholarly work is due to what must seem to be an irresistible urge to shut others out of knowledge which they are perfectly capable of acquiring. Perhaps some do it because it's always been done; perhaps some do it to hide the mental laziness and paucity of substantial thought to which we are no less prone than the rest of the world. The phenomenon is not limited to academics, as anyone who has ever dealt extensively with doctors or automobile mechanics or television repairmen can bear out. Nonetheless, I think it is academics who must take a searching look at the use—and abuse—we make of our most precious communicative tool.

We are only beginning to understand the vast distortions and the personal damage that may have been heightened for centuries by the persistent sexism which pervades our language, both written and spoken. Roles and limitations are inflexibly imposed from earliest comprehension; doctors and lawyers—to say nothing of God—are always "he," secretaries always "she." And so on. No one is likely to argue that language alone is the culprit; of course it reflects the surrounding thought or, more accurately, lack of thought. But language certainly has reinforced, and continues to reinforce, stereotypes of many varieties, and value judgments of many kinds. We may speak of Parisian French and Florentine Italian, but we speak of "good" and "bad" English. We may contend that we are indeed justified, as educators, in insisting on standard English. The unfortunate fact, however, is that those whose English is *not* standard—i.e., is "bad"—generally turn out to be those who have been told all their lives that they are also bad at most other things, because *they* are not standard—or average—and therefore do not possess many of the habits and skills which are standard or average in the larger society. They not only lack the confidence, role models, and societal support of those born with silver lexicons in their mouths—they face further impediments in that they must change what is as natural as walking or laughing, must alienate themselves from their words enough to learn standard English as a

second language. This would be hard enough without the moral judgment attached to their "inferior" dialects. Inferior? What is language, exactly? Are we really unable to understand and communicate with people whose English is not standard? Is it really language which is preventing communication? Or is language bearing the brunt of other moral judgments? How do our attitudes and texts reflect this?

I wonder how many educators have really thought about the problems an inner-city student faces while trying to separate himself or herself from the stream of language which forms and surrounds and is familiar. I wonder how many educators have any idea how disturbing and self-distancing the choices are: whether to use standard English always, and be a stranger at home whose every sentence is a clash between old and new values; or to switch back and forth, further widening the gulfs between personae. We all know how to alter language to our interpretation of particular occasions—witness our insistence on jargon—but for most of us the choices are much less painful. When we approach research which touches on questions like these—and there should be more of it—I think we should do so on interdisciplinary ground. So far we have left out much that might have made our thinking more human, more humane. Perhaps the psychologists and sociologists can help us here. We do not know much about language and feeling, language and learning, language and sociopolitical relations.

These barriers to communication, still so unexplored, are only a handful of the problems in communication among people who ostensibly speak the same language. Those who do *not* share a language face staggering complications, and so far bilingual education and research in foreign language have hardly scratched the surface. Yet those responsible for teaching and research in modern languages do not seem to feel much urgency about helping society solve some of its communications problems. I do not understand why.

The excerpt from the Jean-Baptiste Rousseau poem with which I began was chosen for a convention of those whose professions are in the field of modern languages; they were more likely to understand it than any gathering I have addressed since I became president of Brooklyn College three years ago. Yet those who did *not* understand it—and there were many—probably had a number of reactions: "Oh God, is the whole thing going to be in French?" "Is he going to be obscure and pretentious?" "Why the hell doesn't he speak my language, if he wants me to understand him?"

I am not saying there is no place for French poetry—far from it. The functions of language are so many, so complex. What I am saying is that many of us use language in a solipsistic way. As I speak or write to you, I am trying to communicate some ideas to you which I believe are important; therefore I must do everything I can to make myself understandable to you, and to encourage you to want to listen to me or to read further. I give you a French poem, perhaps because its words describe something I have known in a way which is not directly translatable, or so I believe. And I give you a French poem because to me it is beautiful, and I would like to give you something beautiful. If I think of nothing else, it is hard for me to understand that without knowledge of French my poem might seem "a tale told by an idiot, signifying nothing"; that it might shut you out, irritate you, and make you less able to hear the words which follow it.

At Brooklyn College I do not generally preface my remarks with French poetry. Next semester I am teaching a class in it instead. I would like to be able to give you a mental picture of the college, as I wanted to give you the poem, but it is equally difficult. The excitement of the place, the motion and color and size and sound are not easily expressed. Children run through the open corridors of our Early Childhood Center; grandparents walk slowly to their classes. Our students are old and young and middle-aged; they are Russian, Rumanian, Polish, Lithuanian, Hungarian, German, Scotch, English, Irish, French, Italian, Afro-American, Puerto Rican, Haitian, Bahamian, Chinese, Indian, American Indian. They are Jewish, Catholic, Protestant, Buddhist. They are veterans, people who are physically handicapped, housewives, nurses, policemen, ex-drug addicts, students who attend religious schools during the day and Brooklyn College at night. There are 35,000 of them—people of all kinds. They reflect the borough of Brooklyn far more accurately than was the case before Open Admissions guaranteed all of New York City's high school graduates a place at college if they chose to come.

These students have brought us new life, new hope, new awareness, and new problems. They need strong support services—and as usual there is not enough money. We steal from Peter to pay Paul—borrow is too mild a word. And who, in this case, is Peter? Who is Paul? Do we put our emphasis on counseling rather than classics, remediation rather than research?

Critics of the Open Admissions program fear

the dilution of the academic program and the erosion of scholarly standards. Those who have maintained for years that much of higher education is a credentialing operation are even more concerned now. They wonder whether college will become an only slightly glorified high school, unable to afford advanced study and pure research (whatever that is). They wonder whether the bachelor's degree will lose all meaning, merely adding another notch to the credentialing problem, which is aggravated in turn by the scarcity of jobs.

In an article titled "Effects of the Ph.D. Glut," James Harvey concluded:

> It is difficult to argue with the evidence that if current trends continue, too many Ph.D.'s will be produced for appropriate employment. There is general agreement that substantial unemployment of Ph.D.'s will not result; instead, it is expected that education requirements for various positions will be upgraded, and that Ph.D.'s will displace people with master's degrees. However, if there will not be massive unemployment, the amount of underemployment–the use of Ph.D.'s in positions not allowing them to utilize their research skills–will increase.[1]

One need hardly ask what he forecasts for those with mere bachelor's degrees.

But if we prophesy various kinds of academic doom and do nothing about them we are rather like the people who solve the inner city's problems by moving to the suburbs. As Kahlil Gibran said, "A little knowledge that acts is worth infinitely more than much knowledge that is idle." Perhaps it is subway-tunnel vision, but I believe that Open Admissions is by far the most significant development in higher education in years–and that it offers one of the richest grounds for truly fruitful research.

Since educators certainly believe that education has intense value, its extension to a wider population is largely our responsibility. So are the approaches used: structuring of educational programs for a much wider variety of students; research on successful modes; the monitoring of progress. Henry and Renaud have concluded that "Failure to recognize that students are in different developmental phases when they enter college has been a factor in the failure of colleges to successfully change students in the direction of leading more examined lives." Educators ought to be thinking about the functions of education in a new way, for society generally, and for our fields, and what they can contribute in particular.

We ought to be thinking, too, of the situation in which our students will find themselves upon graduation, and how we can equip them with a generalist view but a specific set of abilities. Echoing Harvey, a National Education Association task force warned last March that the nation

> . . . will under-utilize increasing numbers of college-educated people unless larger numbers of appropriate employment opportunities are opened for college graduates . . . The country needs to use its college educated manpower to accelerate its progress towards the achievement of national goals in education, welfare, justice, transportation, housing, and many other areas. Action is needed now to assure that large numbers of jobs are created which also are appropriate to the capabilities of the increasing supply of college graduates.[2]

With all of these factors to consider, can graduate education and research be less important? Of course not. Who is going to formulate these questions in their totality? Who has the expertise to address and solve them? This is one of the vital new roles of research, as research is one of the vital traditional roles of education. Dillon, McGrath, and Ray point out in a recent article on research and the universities:

> From the very beginning, the idea of a university was to bring students into contact with practicing scholars so that the students, by observing the actual work of a field, could themselves develop into scholars. This was true regardless of the field . . . . Thus the concept of teachers who are actively involved in scholarship is one of the cornerstones of the educational system.[3]

But research and scholarship do not take place in a vacuum; they are not in themselves holy. Too often they do take place within narrow and self-protective boundaries. Don Cameron Allen, in "The Ph.D. in English and American Literature," writes:

> The lack of uniformity in graduate programs is greatly surpassed by our persistent avoidance of self-criticism. The whole system brought across the Atlantic by Americans of the last century has become fossilized, and like all fossils is dead and stone cold. We have only infrequently asked ourselves what we are doing or why we are doing it. The heroes who taught the heroes who taught us invented an American version of the methods they learned at Leipzig or Berlin. They endured it; we endured it; and by all that's holy, our students shall endure it! In primitive societies a youth starved, stuck himself with bone needles, held fire in his hand, and after forty days had a vision from which he took his name; but it is not recorded that any of these initiates called himself "Doctor of Philosophy in English Literature." We have unques-

tioningly followed these primitive customs, but we regard them as high acts of civility. In reconsidering our polished *rites de passage*, we may begin with our graduate courses.[4]

It seems to me that there are many reasons for the recent drop in enrollment in foreign language doctoral programs. Certainly there is—as usual—ever less money to support education, particularly advanced education, particularly in fields which are not obviously crucial to the bread and butter—or guns and butter—of society. There is ordering and reordering of priorities by administrators who do not always have a full understanding of the relative importance of the programs among which they must pick and choose. There are fewer jobs available everywhere, and foreign languages have never been known as fields with vast employment opportunity. Indeed, one recent study of anticipated surpluses of degree recipients in the state of Illinois projected that through 1980 the oversupply of language majors would be greater than that in any other field.[5] (I might add an estimated statistic from a member of my department, who says he thinks that 90% of that oversupply have studied only about 10% of the world's languages—and maybe about 1% of the world's dialects.)

Then there is the orientation of today's students, who are more interested in service occupations, interdisciplinary approaches, and knowledge which they consider practical. Some see languages as a refinement, like needlepoint or playing the harpsichord. Others feel that imagination is more important than knowledge (but then, so did Albert Einstein). Such facts may help to explain the decline in enrollment in these programs. They do not excuse it.

At bottom—*au fond*—we in the field of modern languages are to blame. We are the people to whom language and its nuances should be important; we are the people who should be able to demonstrate, with raw belief and with facts, the incredible importance of language in the fabric of civilization—and in the lack of civilization. I suspect that we have taken ourselves too seriously and our profession not seriously enough; that we have so institutionalized our concept of what advanced study in language involves and is expected to produce that we have nearly turned living languages into dead ones through our lack of understanding and respect for the deadly importance of communication.

Where have we been? There is so much we should have been thinking about and doing. Renshaw, writing on foreign language and intercultural studies in present day college curricula, says:

> There are two important considerations with regard to ... cultural studies. The first is our need, especially in the social sciences and the humanities, for study and insight into the ways of life of other peoples. The urgent need for intercultural understanding can be seen in the "culture shock" of educated Americans abroad. Our social scientists themselves have encountered, and even created, human relations problems in research activities in unfamiliar cultures. Sociologists and anthropologists receive calls for help from social workers, police, and others who do not comprehend the life styles and "substandard" English of even our own minority groups. Too often, we in the various disciplines have chopped out of Max Weber's writings that which is most related to our special field, when what was needed was the total multi-disciplinary approach which his work suggests, and which is summed up in the word that reveals the heart of his methodology—*verstehen*. But there is a second and deeper need for experiences in which the thoughts, feelings and cultural responses of other peoples begin to ring true in our own feelings; this is that such understanding contributes powerfully to an indispensable outside perspective from which we may view and comprehend our own way of life. The ... role of language fundamentals in such cultural understanding is [essential].
>
> In the second place, effective intercultural programs must of their very nature be interdisciplinary. The synthetic character of such programs and courses plays a unifying role in our increasingly splintered and specialized academic processes .... A major weakness in many of the students we receive from the secondary systems is their ineptness in conceptual and analytic thought, and an even weaker grasp of synthetic processes. The presentation of unifying concepts and integrated disciplines (with the faculty flexibility and give-and-take which they entail) is the taproot and trunk of any well-conceived intercultural and language program.[6]

Our students want service occupations; they want interdisciplinary approaches; they have the potential for a truly global view. The technology that helps to shape their lives has made them far more likely to travel abroad than we; far more likely to meet people of other cultures; far more likely to feel themselves part of a world community and want to solve its problems. This being so, why have we not had the imagination to envisage the vastly widened role of communication—particularly through language—in their lives? Why have we not long since given them to understand that language study is not an anachronism, but an ever more important part of life?

The world has sickened on war; it has sickened on chauvinistic secrecy and partial approaches to systemic problems. "Independence?" said George Bernard Shaw, "that's middle class blasphemy. We are all dependent on one another, every soul of us on earth." Perhaps too few of us honestly believe that. More and more of our children do. And that has enormous implications for the new kinds of research which ought to be taking place in the field of language, some of which I have been suggesting. Certainly some of the language barriers—the jargon, value judgments on dialects, sexist exclusions—could be investigated and perhaps toppled by those with a global perspective. If, of course, they were to be motivated and taught by people with a strong sense of the responsibility and potential of language study, of language as communication.

The single most important tool for establishing a genuinely global sense of community is language—and I do not mean the development of a world language, though periodically we attempt one. I mean an understanding and dignifying of communication which will include the psychologists, sociologists, anthropologists, computer scientists, historians, economists, political scientists. I mean an awareness of our very human temptation to obfuscate, to isolate, to self-aggrandize, to turn knowledge to power, to create personal safety by shutting others out. I mean a good look at language as a breathing, ever-changing image of us as we are and as a tool which can help us get where we want to go.

Language isn't a profession; it's the best hope of human contact, and therefore of peace, of real evolution. Yet we, its exponents, have drifted into a corner from which we do not come forth to explain with any urgency why funds must be found and research supported; to explain why there is no field more practical, nor more idealistic. It is nearly incomprehensible.

[1] *Change*, 4 (April 1972), p. 71.

[2] *Higher Education and National Affairs Newsletter*, 21 (17 March 1972).

[3] James A. Dillon, Jr., James W. McGrath, and Dale C. Ray, "Research in the University," *Journal of Higher Education*, 43 (April 1972).

[4] p. 109.

[5] Roger H. Bezdek, *College Educated Manpower in the State of Illinois, 1970-1980*, report prepared for the Long-Range Planning Committee of the University of Illinois (1971).

[6] J. Parke Renshaw, "Foreign Languages and Intercultural Studies in Present-Day College Curricula," *Journal of Higher Education*, 43 (April 1972), pp. 298-9.

ADE and ADFL Conference Reports

The membership of ADE and ADFL were represented at the Austin Conference by Professors Marilyn Williamson (English, Wayne State Univ.) and Robert G. Mead, Jr. (Romance Languages, Univ. of Connecticut), who undertook to prepare reports for presentation at the 1972 MLA Convention in New York, at the annual meetings of the respective Associations. Professor Williamson's report, "The MLA-ADE-ADFL Conference on the Research Component of the Ph.D.," appears in the March 1973 issue of the *ADE Bulletin*; Professor Mead's paper, "Reassessing the Ph.D. in Foreign Languages," is reprinted in the corresponding issue of the *ADFL Bulletin*.

REPORTS FROM DISCUSSION GROUPS

PARTICIPANTS at the Austin Conference were divided into four discussion groups, with two groups (one primarily for English and one primarily for foreign language representatives) concentrating on problems relating to the structure and content of the research component of the Ph.D., and two groups (with the same division between English and foreign language representatives) concentrating on administrative policy, enrollments, and the job market.

Participants in the groups dealing with the structure and content of the research component were asked to explore questions such as the following: Are present course requirements, foreign language requirements, qualifying examinations, dissertations, etc., adequately preparing scholars to carry on legitimate and significant research programs? Are our present demands excessive? Not stringent enough? Are there new areas of research that are not presently being developed in graduate programs? To what extent should basic research be emphasized or even included in graduate programs other than the Ph.D.? Is highly specialized research endangered by the present interest in generalists and the move in some schools toward interdisciplinary work? How can interest in the less popular research areas be maintained? Are opportunities for sharing faculty and research resources being pursued at present? Are research and publication inseparable? How do research degrees serve the national interest?

A similar series of questions was proposed as a basis for discussion in those groups concentrating on administrative policy, enrollments, and the job market: Is the traditional research-oriented Ph.D. still a "viable commodity" on today's job market? Will future needs differ from past? In what ways, if at all, do graduate research programs realistically prepare students to teach in two-year or even four-year college programs? How can the research component of a graduate degree (language requirements, specialized seminars, scholarly papers, dissertations, etc.) be coordinated with the training of effective college-level teachers? Should graduate admissions to research-oriented Ph.D. programs be reduced? What kinds of counseling might departments provide to better prepare graduate students for the exigencies of an academic career in the 1970's?

It was recognized from the outset that the four discussion groups, working in two 90-minute sessions, could not hope to come up with definitive answers. No attempt was made to formalize the proceedings or to come to any consensus of opinion through voting. The summary reports are, however, of value insofar as they reflect the broad areas of concern that evolved among the four groups of knowledgeable representatives of Ph.D.-granting departments which addressed themselves independently to basic issues.

Printed below are, first, the two reports from groups concentrating on the structure and content of the research component of the Ph.D., and then the two reports from groups concerned primarily with administrative problems, enrollments, and the job market. None of the groups, it will be noticed, was expected to or was able to limit discussion to the specific questions or even the general topic.

* * * * *

Foreign Languages, Group A:

After a prolonged discussion of the present need to reassess the goals and procedures of graduate work in the modern languages, the group affirmed its belief in the importance of research as a cardinal ingredient of Ph.D. work, but insisted that its function within a program of graduate study and training, particularly for future teachers, requires definition.

Whether we assume that research leads to an increase in knowledge or a sharpening of critical and historical perception, the group considered its pursuit the minimal safeguard against an uncritical acceptance of received opinion. The group recognized that not every student can be expected to contribute significantly to the advancement of knowledge through publication, but believed at the same time that proper training in research is an essential prerequisite of good teaching.

While it was recognized that the subject matter of our discipline aims at an understanding of a comprehensive body of culture, the group affirmed its conviction that it was through literature and linguistics that we must achieve such an understanding. The need for interdisciplinary investigations and procedures was recognized, with the proviso, however, that it is preferable to seek the help of specialists from other disciplines than to pretend to an expertise in other fields that we cannot claim to possess. Generally speaking, a

broadening of the curriculum beyond the present departmental programs may be desirable; the effective study of one or more related minor fields should be made feasible. The feeling of the group was that interdepartmental studies do not endanger, but might rather enrich specialized research. Interdepartmental research projects, indeed team research, were urged as potentially useful procedures.

We have been more liberal in permitting students to take a variety of courses than in our definition of dissertation topics. It was suggested, for instance, that a critical translation of a substantial work in the foreign language could be an acceptable exercise. While it was agreed that the thesis should be concerned with traditional and historical topics, the group thought that under an appropriate system of interdepartmental supervision, a thesis might range beyond the limits of a departmental specialty.

Students today appear remarkably aware of the importance of methodology and are eager to reflect upon principles and critical theory. To sharpen this interest and to give it direction should be a central goal of all teaching and research activities; what seems to be needed is a clearer definition than is usually offered of the methods employed by our discipline, and possibly of related fields. Some members of the group saw the need to urge a reversal of the trend of recent years to speed up graduate study; the advantages of efficiency, it was felt, should be subordinated to the needs of adequate training.

There were differences of opinion among the group as to the point at which students should be encouraged to define areas of study that might result in a dissertation. Some thought it should be as early as possible; others want to permit the student to explore at a more leisurely pace a wider range of research possibilities.

If we are to recognize the importance of research in a Ph.D. program, particularly for future teachers, it may be necessary to reassess the nature of the comprehensive examination. This general examination should not be a mere testing of accumulated factual knowledge – possibly defined by a formidable reading list – but an examination in depth of relatively limited areas and problems in which the candidate can be expected to demonstrate his grasp of principles and his capacity to analyze and organize the given material. We should make sure, through a continual reassessment of examination procedures, that they occur in the context of professional teaching and/or research goals. Some thought that part of the examination procedures should be a demonstration of the student's capacity to act as a teacher, perhaps by delivering a lecture.

Victor Lange, Chairman
Micheline Dufau, Recorder

* * * * *

English, Group A:

The group addressed itself to the structure and content of the research component of the Ph.D.; the initial discussion was far ranging and touched upon the forms that the dissertation might take–and even alternatives to it. During this discussion there was no expression of dissatisfaction with the present pattern of course requirements, foreign language requirements, and qualifying examinations in the preparation of the Ph.D., as varied as they may be in the different educational institutions. While the absence of discussion on these points may stem in part from a frustrating lack of time which prevented us from giving detailed consideration to all the problems of research at the Ph.D. level, it can perhaps be inferred that no one in our group came to this conference bent on proposing radical changes in these areas.

The group also discussed at great length the nature of research at the graduate level and its relationship to preparation for college teaching. It was felt that the dissertation should be an integral part of a graduate student's training–that it should stem from course work and be related to the kinds of activity in which college teachers normally engage. It prepares a student in the use of research tools and develops a quality of mind that prepares a candidate for a professional career as both teacher and scholar. It was also felt that the dissertation need not be of a single design–that our discipline is large enough to accommodate interests that are historical or interdisciplinary, as well as more purely literary. The committee felt that past research does not set the only legitimate models for present research, and that works studied in the past can be restudied by other critical modes as these modes are being developed. We can, that is, place the study of literature in important and diversified research contexts; we can profit today from the work being done not only by the comparatists, but also by structuralist critics, anthropologists and folklorists, and even the work of the social commentator on the modern city, to name only a few examples. The researcher's obligation is to convince fellow scholars that he has raised questions and provided answers that enhance the understanding of the

literary work. To this end, Professor Jordan offered the following resolution, which in substance expresses the belief of many of the participants:

> We reaffirm the importance of the research component of the Ph.D. degree, urging that research be understood to include responsible accumulation and interpretation of knowledge, as well as original "contributions to knowledge." The dissertation should be looked upon primarily as a training device, in the belief that rigorous, sustained experience in discovering, evaluating, and organizing historical and critical materials is not only essential for scholars but is also of broad value for teachers at all levels.

Richard Lehan, Chairman
Robert Stevick, Recorder

* * * * *

Foreign Languages, Group B:

The suggestions made below are the result of the group's discussion of an assigned subject, namely "Administrative Policy, Enrollments, and the Job Market," within the framework of a research-oriented Ph.D. program that purports to prepare graduate students for the teaching profession. Our first question was, "How does one prepare a professor for his chosen profession? Does what he learns in graduate school and what is required of him to obtain his degree help him to become an effective teacher? If so, for what level?" The group started out by recognizing the challenging mass of material in our fields and the diversity of backgrounds of our students (particularly in recent years with the recruitment of minorities and the desire of many married women to return to the universities after their children have grown). We also considered the present imbalance between the number of teachers and available jobs. These considerations led us to the suggestion that each doctoral department undertake to reexamine its own strengths and weaknesses and consciously set out to develop programs in which it can expect to maintain special competency or develop unique resources. We saw no need for all programs to be patterned on the same "traditional" models.

The group recognized also that teaching opportunities exist at three different levels: graduate departments, four-year colleges, junior colleges, and below. We felt, however, that for such a diversity of teaching opportunities there can be *a unity of training*. To this end there were suggestions to the effect that departments should endeavor to develop coherent programs which combine training in teaching methods: not abstract pedagogy but, on the contrary, specific approaches to the teaching of the various areas a Ph.D. is called upon to teach, including freshman composition, language courses, culture and civilization, theoretical and applied linguistics, the study of literature, and tools to conduct research in any of these areas. It was thought that it would be more useful for departments to organize their work in terms of *programs* which integrate these components rather than by merely assembling courses the graduate professors feel like teaching, whether these courses address themselves to the needs of the students or simply to their own needs as scholars. In any event, the coherent programs we have in mind should try to make full use of the widest possible range of university and community resources.

Some specific suggestions related to the above considerations were made. In the particular case of training for foreign language teaching it was thought highly desirable that it should profit from the availability of oral materials and opportunities for study abroad. Since a different approach is needed to teach a literature in translation, a job our graduates are increasingly asked to do, it was felt that it is incumbent upon foreign language departments to undertake training and research in this area. The group felt very strongly the need for students to take broad courses in humanities and general education as well as courses in related areas: history, philosophy, anthropology, and other social sciences when appropriate, as well as English literature courses (in the case of the students from foreign language departments) and courses in foreign literatures of their choice (in the case of students from English departments). It was also felt that doctoral research projects need not necessarily be limited to a specialized national corpus but should make use of the resources and methods of related areas and disciplines, provided that these methods are acquired first through thorough training and research before any attempt is made at their implementation.

Finally, and addressing ourselves specifically to foreign language departments, it was suggested that the organization of these departments should reflect the understanding that language is not only an end in itself, but also a basis for the understanding of vital aspects of other disciplines. To this end, collaboration with English and other language departments should be welcomed, along with participation in larger structures such as divisions of literature, comparative literature programs, area studies programs, and the like. It was

stressed very strongly during our discussions that at all levels of graduate training we should try to wed the analytical skills of the philosopher (the proper province of a doctorate of philosophy) with the public issues which should be a part of the daily concern of any teacher. To foster an "ivory tower" mentality in the students we train for the teaching profession would ultimately result in alienation between the universities and the public that supports them.

Rodolfo Cardona, Chairman
Charles Porter, Recorder

* * * * *

English, Group B:

The group reached general agreement that a doctoral thesis or a series of research projects is an integral part of doctoral work in English. There was, however, disagreement in the group as to the amount of change needed in our traditional research programs to adjust them to the needs of those who will teach in four-year colleges which do not and probably will not offer graduate work.

We also discussed the proposition that "departments with Ph.D. programs should use their resources to make a major contribution to the training of teachers for the community colleges." There was no consensus as to whether adaptations should be research-oriented with an added option in the Ph.D. program or a program at the M.A. level. Indeed, although there was general agreement as to the need for change–for more options–in current Ph.D. programs, there was no consensus as to how radical these changes should be or as to the specific research options we should encourage in the Ph.D. program. In spite of the general agreement that the Ph.D. programs should be pluralistic and produce versatile scholar-teachers, there was some disagreement as to what the components should be and at what time in the student's program they should occur. Nor was there full agreement on the amount and kind of pedagogical training Ph.D. candidates should receive.

The group discussed the opportunities for substantive inter- or multi-disciplinary doctoral research in English and noted, especially, opportunities for research involving language and literature and the other humanities, the fine arts, the social and behavioral sciences, and perhaps other areas.

We agreed on the general unreliability of the current state of educational manpower forecasting and recommended that the profession should gather more regularly precise data on admissions, enrollments, degrees awarded, and placement of graduates. While commending those departments which have taken steps to adjust graduate enrollments to current realistic market needs, we urged departments against overreacting to the current bleak job picture. Not only will steps taken now influence the profession for a minimum of four more years, but steps to curtail enrollments further will deprive some students of a non-job-related opportunity to benefit from the liberalizing, humanizing value of an education in language and literature. We do urge, however, that students should be adequately counseled about the state of the job market.

The group recognized the emergence of adult and continuing education as a new source of highly diverse graduate students. The obligation to relate our work in language and literature more effectively to public needs was explored at length. We suggest pluralism in graduate programs for the master's as well as doctor's degree. And we recommend to graduate departments that they embark on serious self-examination of their programs, research resources, and future goals.

George Hendrick, Chairman
Richard Green, Recorder

About ADE and ADFL

The Association of Departments of English, representing more than 1,000 two- and four-year college and university departments of English, was established in 1962. Departmental dues are $35.00 per academic year. The Association of Departments of Foreign Languages, representing some 950 departments of foreign languages, was established in 1969. Departmental dues are $20.00 per academic year. For further information about the associations, write to ADE or ADFL, 62 Fifth Avenue, New York City, New York 10011.

REWARDING EXCELLENCE AND PROMISE*

Allan Cartter
Carnegie Commission on Higher Education

JUST TEN years ago, when I was finishing my stint as dean of a graduate school and giving my last annual report (I'm a little embarrassed to remember it now), I was urgently telling my colleagues that we had to expand graduate education throughout the country in all disciplines to avoid a chaotic decline in the quality of college faculties. Two years later, with responsibility for a commission of the American Council on Education studying trends and trying to evaluate developments in American higher education, I published several articles that predicted a rather dramatic shift to an academic "buyers' market" starting about 1969 or 1970. I lost some of my friends among my former decanal colleagues for that reversal. I remember one wrote me a letter and said, "You have become a grey eminence in higher education—spoiling the market, subverting graduate education and the national interest."

To the economist, the academic labor market is interesting to study. It is a fascinating institution, and it has a lot of peculiar characteristics. On the supply side of the market, it is confusing because there's a five to ten year time lag between the time people make decisions to go on for the Ph.D. and their actual attainment of it. There's a very high degree of specialization and very limited substitutability. A geologist cannot step in and teach the Romantic poets. In addition, scholars are less responsive to market inducements than are people in many other occupations. I would remind you that all during the depression of the 1930's, despite the deteriorating job market, Ph.D. output increased 6% every year. It is also a peculiar market in that the market signals themselves are both blurred by time by this gap between entry and exit, and also by a kind of institutional filter—the fact that universities very often act as a kind of market buffer rather than as a kind of transmitter.

On the demand side there are other peculiar characteristics. Sixty percent of graduate school output—that is, young men and women with Ph.D.'s—finally end up in the academic marketplace. And two-thirds of the others, principally supported in research and development, are dependent upon government funds. For a decade up until 1968 all systems were go; both academic employment and government spending on research and development encouraged a very rapid expansion in graduate education. For the last several years this has suddenly been reversed. There is now only slow growth in the hiring of new teachers and a decline in real terms in the amount of research and development support from the federal government since 1967.

But the most distinguishing characteristic of this market is that our graduate school energies are largely reproductive; we are reproducing ourselves. The graduate schools are chiefly concerned with their own institutional well-being. We develop new Ph.D. programs to achieve a balance of offerings within the institution, very seldom asking about what the nation needs or the region needs. We think primarily of the health of the institution. And it has become almost a natural law that you can't build a first rate university or a strong department except through growth.

Frequently, when I've talked on academic labor market projections, people have said, "Well, since you knew this was coming, *your* university must have been much better prepared for it than others." I've had to confess that it's hard to convince your own faculty or your own department chairmen. About two years ago I got all of my department heads together and said, "Now, here's the emerging crisis. What are we going to do about it?" And they sat there for a while and then replied, "But it's not our fault. It's all those new schools out there. You know, it's Bowling Green and Stony Brook and the City University of New York that are spoiling the market. Somebody ought to do something about it."

But the most peculiar characteristic of the academic labor market is that the production and marketing functions are rather separate, to use a business analogy. If you're RCA and you're producing a bad product and can't market it, or you're producing much more than people want, then you have to go in and make tough decisions (such as RCA did with its computer division) and say, "Off with its head." There is a kind of feedback that makes a business firm react quickly, almost instantly, to its own mistakes. In the

*Revised from an address given at the Symposium on the Future of Graduate Education at Purdue University, 14 March 1972. Until 1972 Dr. Cartter was Chancellor of New York University.

academic marketplace that isn't true. We, as institutions, don't take the responsibility for finding jobs for the people who go through the graduate schools. We may be very sympathetic; we may help them; we may write letters of recommendation; we may have a placement office. But it has not been considered our responsibility to place them. And if we turn out too many Ph.D.'s in our English department, we tell them "Go and cry on the shoulders of the Modern Language Association; that's the group that ought to worry about it." The result is that the academic institutions tend to act very independently of market forces, much more so than almost any other institution one can think of in this country.

So I am glad the theme tonight is graduate education *to* the year 2000, not *at* 2000, because the hardest task, I believe, is going to be getting there. In those three decades, the next dozen years are going to be the most difficult. This is likely to be the time of agonizing adjustment and reappraisal in all of graduate education. We have had fifteen years of phenomenal growth. Ph.D. output has expanded at a compound rate of about 12% annually. Starting from a fairly stable base in the 1950's of about 8,500 doctorates granted each year, we have gotten up to 32,000 for the current year. We have a present capacity estimated at something like 45,000 Ph.D.'s annually. We have a planned capacity, according to several studies for the late 1970's, of somewhere between 55,000 and 70,000 annually. Until 1969 the academic marketplace, principally college teaching, had always absorbed at least 50% of new Ph.D.'s–lower in the science and engineering fields, higher in the humanities. About 60% finally ended up in colleges and universities, although some by a more circuitous route through post-doctoral employment and other types of non-teaching jobs. This year, only about 40% of the Ph.D.'s are finding jobs in academic employment, and many of them are taking positions at somewhat lower levels than they had been trained for or had aspired to.

Looking ahead, if every new college teacher hired in the senior institutions in this country had the Ph.D., and at least 50% of all the new junior college teachers hired had the doctorate–and that's a much higher goal than we've ever aspired to in the past–then the need for new college professors is predicted at about 15,000 annually for the first half of the 1970's, about 10,000 annually in the second half of the 1970's, and something less than 5,000 annually out to 1985. After 1990 employment may pick up again largely because of demographic factors. By then we will have been through a sharp contraction of the 18 to 21 year old group that is almost the symmetrical counterbalance of the rapid expansion we had in the 1960's. So in the late '80's and '90's there may be some expansion again, but the continued decline in fertility rates is not a cause for optimism. It is obvious, as we look ahead over the next twenty years, that higher education is not going to be a major growth industry as it has been in the past..

We are already at the point where something like 60% of high school graduates now enter formal degree programs in higher education, and another 12% or 13% go on into post-secondary non-degree education. Thus we're already absorbing nearly three-fourths of the high school graduates in this country. Rising college entrance rates will not contribute signficantly to enrollment expansion in the future. In terms of the next fifteen years, therefore, I think it's going to be fairly clear that we will have excess capacity in most of our graduate schools somewhere in the range of 25% to 50%. The big problem I would like to emphasize is not really today; most of today's problems are the result of the immediate impact of recession and some adjustments because of difficulties in federal and state budgets. The big problem is at least five years ahead, and the critical time is going to be the early 1980's.

This situation poses several problems for us both nationally and institutionally. On a nationwide basis we have to ask how we can shrink the graduate establishment in some orderly fashion without just following a Malthusian solution–starving off the children and undernourishing the mothers, if this is the parallel to graduate students and institutions. Somehow we must manage to stabilize the support in higher education for strong educational programs rather than having legislatures or congresses that impose across-the-board cuts on every institution. I think we have to ask ourselves whether there is any way we can cut back to having only 75 to 100 major national graduate schools, perhaps federally supported, rather than the 250 to 300 Ph.D.-granting institutions that we now have.

We will also have the problem in some fields of how to prevent an overreaction. Right now many people are worried about the case of physics, which was perhaps hardest hit by the drop in external support and demand for new positions. Current enrollment patterns suggest that Ph.D.'s in physics will drop from about 1,600 today to only 800 five years from now. This raises the question of whether one needs as many physics departments as we now have or whether we're going to have substantial excess capacity in each one. There

are those, particularly Richard Freeman at Chicago, who argue that this is the way the market works and that we have to expect it to work that way. If we're going to get appropriate market adjustments, we have to be willing to avoid interfering with it by undue incentives and subsidies. Freeman has offered a fairly convincing thesis that many educators and legislators have accepted: given about five-year time-lags, the market really works very well in making these adjustments. Market adjustments are terribly painful, however, for the individuals who unexpectedly find they're in a surplus situation. And, as we're now finding out, it's terribly painful on the academic institutions themselves.

Within public systems as well as within private institutions the hardest economic adjustments right now are resulting from fluctuations in external support. The most critical problems for the future, however, are likely to be in the humanities and social sciences which rely so heavily upon college teaching as their major employment source.

Institutionally, I think we will have to do a lot of things. We will have to reassess retirement and tenure policies. If we don't do that, we're going to find that we have institutions that are losing their vigor. Between now and 1990 the average age of college professors may rise by almost ten years. There is going to be very little new net hiring in college teaching unless there is a surprising amount of rotation through the ranks—much more so than we've had in the past. If we're going to reduce retirement ages and change tenure policies, this in turn is going to add a lot of pressure for faculty unionization which may end up in even less flexible personnel policies within academic institutions. This is going to create difficult internal stresses and strains, already evident in some universities.

I think we're also going to have to reassess the extent of our commitment to graduate programs and ask ourselves much more seriously whether we can be all things to all people with such limited resources, or whether many of us should discontinue programs or not initiate new programs in areas where we have planned to expand. I think we're going to come under increasing pressure, especially in the state systems, for much greater rationalization of our programs, much greater cooperation among institutions, and much greater pressure for broader training with less emphasis upon the narrow specialties within disciplines. At a very interesting conference at MIT about a year ago attended by many of the graduate students there, the common cry was, "For God's sake, don't make us so overspecialized. We come out prepared for one little phase of nuclear engineering and if there's not a job there, we are in a very difficult position." So there is increasing pressure from students, much of it constructive, to broaden the kind of training they get.

I would guess that twenty-five years from now, after we've gone through this trauma, we're going to have fewer universities granting the Ph.D. degree than today, although many more perhaps granting the master's. I think we're going to be somewhat more successful in breaking down the boundaries between disciplines. I think there's going to be a tendency for graduate education to take a leaf out of medical education and to develop a kind of two-stage training period—a compressed formal degree program and a somewhat expanded post-classroom period much like the internship and residency period in medicine. This could represent a kind of liberalizing of graduate education. It seems rather ironic that we train teachers in the liberal arts in the most fractured, illiberal educational environment we ever could have devised.

The financing of graduate education, I'm sure, is going to be much more heavily dependent upon federal funding, with all of the risks and yet all of the opportunities that may raise. Student support is likely to be based more upon need than just talent and merit. And I think it's fairly evident that we have to break down many of the barriers of the past, many of them unconscious, some of them conscious, that have kept the numbers in minority groups, whether by sex or by race, very underrepresented in many of our professions.

If we're going to survive as vigorous institutions, we will have to find a way of rewarding excellence and promise and be somewhat more ruthless than we have been in the past in our willingness to weed out mediocrity within our institutions. Neither the taxpayer nor the student is going to put up with some of the built-in inflexibilities that we have developed in higher education.

ON THE FUTURE OF GRADUATE EDUCATION*

William D. Schaefer
Modern Language Association

THIS DISCUSSION of the future of graduate education will concentrate on two areas of development: first, the need for a broader base in American higher education that can provide ways and means for an adult liberal education going beyond the four-year college program; and, second, the need within presently structured academic channels to respond to what I am assuming will be an increased demand for intensive and highly specialized professional training of all kinds. In other words, what I am looking toward are graduate programs involving breadth so broad as to expand well beyond the perimeters of the university campus, and depth so deep, if you will, that they continue to enrich our society not only with presently undreamed of tools but with the wisdom that must necessarily accompany the use of any tool.

Turning first to the broader necessities, I think we must begin by recognizing that the two-year colleges are in many subtle ways already having and will continue to have a significant effect on graduate education. There are at present more than one thousand two-year colleges in this country, representing close to 40% of all American institutions of higher education; and these schools presently enroll some two and one-half million students, more than one-quarter of the total college population. The growth, as we all know, has been phenomenal, an increase in two-year college enrollments between 1966 and 1970 of some 64% as compared to a relatively modest 24% increase at four-year institutions over the same period. We have not, I believe, even begun to measure the impact these two-year colleges will have on the American scene now that our inalienable rights include life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness, and two years at the local junior college. And what is fascinating about all of this is not so much the question of financing, although that too is an intriguing problem, but the question of how high is up in higher education.

If the B.A. degree, or a reasonable facsimile thereof, is replacing the high school diploma as one's ticket to a place in the sun, then what in turn happens to the master's degree or to the doctorate or to post-doctoral education? We appear to be involved in an inflationary cycle of degree programs, and the B.A., which many parents considered to be an impossible dream, is now very much a reality for large segments of the population. At present I see no serious prospect of America's moving to universal, compulsory college education which, as my fellow panelist, Allan Cartter, has shrewdly observed, is a very different concept from that of universal access to post-secondary education or from equal opportunity to a college education with certain merits or strengths. But whatever happens to those 2½ or 4½ or 8½ million students who have at least been exposed to something called higher education, with or without a B.A. degree, there is no doubt in my mind that their appetites will have been whetted. A little learning may or may not be a dangerous thing, but I am ready and willing to take my chances just as long as the academic community is ready and willing to provide the means for continuing to satisfy that appetite, both inside and outside of the college campus.

The idea of a non-objective master's degree, much less a doctorate, is very much out of fashion. Increasingly, I find that graduate admissions are based on pragmatic criteria that evaluate the candidate not only in terms of chances for academic success but also of potential professional employment. And surely in 1972 one can sympathize with graduate departments which, already faced with a large number of degree candidates in danger of being under- or even unemployed, are reluctant to expand admissions, even if they had the funding for such expansion, which most, of course, do not. As a department chairman, I turned away potentially qualified candidates from admission to the Ph.D. program. Not so much because there was no room for them, but because I was painfully aware that so many already qualified Ph.D. candidates are playing musical chairs, and that when the music stops, far too many are being left unseated. Indeed, in my own department I also argued against continuing our traditional M.A. program as a sort of a one year extension on the B.A. degree, a program full of classes and papers but signifying next to nothing on the job market. I think that my actions in this time and in this place are defensible. But I am now arguing that during the next thirty years

*Revised from an address to the Symposium on the Future of Graduate Education at Purdue University, 14 March 1972.

graduate departments are going to have to reconsider such programs and begin to develop liberal arts post-graduate opportunities for the student who is not professionally oriented but who simply wants, at any time in his or her life, to profit from the intellectual rigor and the intellectual climate of formalized higher education. And I trust that it goes without saying that intellectual rigor is underscored, for we cannot afford, literally or figuratively, to sacrifice high standards in offering such programs.

Such programs would not, however, meet the needs of most post-graduate or, let us say, post-college Americans. For life fortunately has a way of intervening, and most people, after a period of time engaged in classroom studies, do find jobs, raise families, grow their swimming pools. How then can higher education respond to the leisure-time educational needs of this segment of society? Presumably by offering something on the far side of an adult Sesame Street. Here I think is one of graduate education's greatest challenges—to find an effective way of meeting that portion of the so-called educational periphery (currently estimated at being in excess of 60 million and growing rapidly) that is qualified for and anxious for graduate education without entering graduate school. The tools, I think, are at our disposal, and by this I mean that the means for mass communication are already adequate, more than adequate, for all normal purposes. What we at present do with these means strikes me as being far less than adequate, for with a few notable exceptions, the bulk of that which is presently available in periodicals, magazines, especially on radio and television, is an insult to the intelligence of an alert ten year old. I am aware of the nature and the extent of the problems involved in this area of mass adult post-graduate education, and I am confident of only one thing—that there are no easy answers. But I do suggest that this area of adult post-college, non-classroom education is not only our greatest challenge for the 1970's and 1980's, but is also our greatest opportunity and even, I think, our special responsibility as humanists. I think we have to encourage and nurture the climate of receptivity, but we also have to be prepared to deliver the goods. And the product, no matter how it is packaged, must be genuine.

The second area on which I would like to comment very briefly concerns the traditional role of graduate education—training the professional through intensive specialization. In recent years we have surely all read and heard a good deal about new degree programs which place an emphasis on development of teaching skills. I do not intend to go into the specific problems of alternate degree programs—MAT's, MAJCTS's, DA's, DAT's, CPhils', MPhil's, EdD's, PhC's, the PhDT—a subject I have treated elsewhere under the title "Alphabet Soup: A Few Words of Caution."[1] Nor would I deny that we need to employ all of our ingenuity and talents in discovering new and more effective means of training teachers, especially those with the skills necessary for handling remedial courses in Open Admissions programs. What interests me here, however, and what I would like to stress because I think it touches on a broader issue, is the differentiation in graduate programs in training these specialists and in training the so-called "generalist," a currently fashionable word, at least in the humanities, and one which along with its companion "interdisciplinary" is frequently trotted round as a sort of panacea to all our ills. What we are talking about, or I think should be talking about, is the training of a graduate student who in spite of, or in addition to, a specialized scholarly or research interest has enough breadth of knowledge to be able to connect part to part, parts to the whole, and the whole to any of its parts, which is pretty much what Joyce's Stephen Daedalus was talking about in insisting on wholeness, harmony, and radiance as being essential to the creative process. Defined this way, I see the generalist as being the most highly trained specialist of all, an expert, if you will, in the general, a twentieth-century sort of Renaissance man who is capable of doing specialized research in his general area, is aware of and can fully understand the work being done by his specialist colleagues, but whose field of specialization is in putting it all together, in providing the total perspective. This, I believe, is potentially our ideal undergraduate teacher, assuming of course that such a person can teach or at any rate does not become nauseous upon entering the classroom. And this, I think, is the kind of Ph.D. specialist we should be working to develop, not instead of, but in addition to our present kind of specialist. This is, in fact, the highest degree of all, and if we wanted to play "alphabet soup," I would give its recipient an extra P in the Ph.D.—or maybe just an asterisk would do.

My fear, however, is that we are beginning to move in a different direction, and in eliminating the rigors of research and scholarship from doctoral programs are tending to create the antithesis of my ideal Renaissance scholar, that is, a dilettante whose little learning looks good only in relation to the bumper-sticker mentality of so many of our high school graduates, a kind of learning which is indeed in the long run a dangerous thing. I cannot

say how high is up in higher education, but I do think it should be a good deal higher than it tends to be at present. All of this, of course, applies also to graduate education for the non-academic, the specialized generalist who chooses, for whatever reason, not to enter the classroom, but instead, whether in the sciences or the humanities, decides to embark upon a career in the world of commerce and industry. For here, I suspect, we above all need individuals who can play administrative leadership roles in which there can be an effective, responsible drawing together of the strings. How very few of us these days are capable of functioning, sometimes even of communicating, outside of our own spheres of specialization. The accounting office talks only to the computer specialist and the computer specialist talks only to God.

Unavoidably, my remarks have been highly impressionistic, and perhaps even somewhat idealistic. The reality of the moment is, of course, a very different matter: the absurdly small percentage of minority students enrolled in graduate programs, the unemployment statistics among qualified M.A.'s and Ph.D.'s, the financial deficits plaguing so very many universities. We must as a nation weigh our priorities with great care, and I can only hope that as we continue to do so in the coming decades, we will increasingly recognize the highest realms of higher education to be our greatest national resource, one which we cannot afford not to support at whatever the cost.

[1] *College English* (January 1973).

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS
University of Texas at Austin
7-9 December 1972

Program Group

Richard I. Brod, ADFL Coordinator, Modern Language Association
John C. Gerber, Chairman, English, Univ. of Iowa
W. R. Keast, Chairman, English, Univ. of Texas
John W. Kneller, President, Brooklyn College, CUNY
Gordon N. Ray, President, John Simon Guggenheim Foundation
William D. Schaefer, Executive Secretary, Modern Language Association
J. Thomas Shaw, Slavic Languages, Univ. of Wisconsin
Michael F. Shugrue, ADE Coordinator, Modern Language Associaton
Bernard Weinberg, Romance Languages, Univ. of Chicago
Stanley Werbow, Dean, Humanities, Univ. of Texas

English Chairmen

Richard P. Adams, Tulane Univ.
Jacob H. Adler, Purdue Univ.
W. B. Carnochan, Stanford Univ.
A. Dwight Culler, Yale Univ.
Joseph I. Fradin, State Univ. of New York, Buffalo
Joseph Frank, Univ. of Massachusetts
Russell Fraser, Univ. of Michigan
Donald Gray, Indiana Univ.
Richard Green, Univ. of Florida
William Harmon, Univ. of North Carolina
George Hendrick, Univ. of Illinois
Samuel L. Hynes, Northwestern Univ.
John E. Jordan, Univ. of California, Berkeley
*R. James Kaufmann, Univ. of Texas
Richard D. Lehan, Univ. of California, Los Angeles
William A. Madden, Univ. of Minnesota
Barry A. Marks, American Univ.
*Joel Porte, Harvard Univ.
Robert R. Raymo, New York Univ.
Richard Ruland, Washington Univ. (St. Louis)
Charles T. Scott, Univ. of Wisconsin
Robert D. Stevick, Univ. of Washington
Bain T. Stewart, Univ. of Tennessee
David H. Stewart, Pennsylvania State Univ.
*W. O. Sutherland, Jr., Univ. of Texas, Austin
Stuart M. Tave, Univ. of Chicago
Donald F. Theall, McGill Univ.
*Robert Y. Turner, Univ. of Pennsylvania
Marilyn Williamson, Wayne State Univ.
*Carl Woodring, Columbia Univ.

Foreign Language Chairmen

*Theodore Andersson, Spanish and Portuguese, Univ. of Texas

*The asterisk designates chairmen's representatives.

*Vincente Cantarino, Spanish and Portuguese, Univ. of Texas
Rodolfo Cardona, Spanish and Portuguese, Univ. of Texas
W. Robert Connor, Classics, Princeton Univ.
Micheline Dufau, French and Italian, Univ. of Massachusetts
John Fein, Romance, Duke Univ.
Harry Haile, Germanic Languages, Univ. of Illinois
Victor Lange, Germanic Languages, Princeton Univ.
Winfred Lehmann, Linguistics, Univ. of Texas
*Robert G. Mead, Jr., Romance and Classical Languages, Univ. of Connecticut
Joseph Michel, Foreign Language Education, Univ. of Texas
Sidney Monas, Slavic Languages, Univ. of Texas
Rose-Marie Oster, Germanic Languages, Univ. of Colorado
Marcelino C. Penuelas, Romance Languages, Univ. of Washington
*Charles Porter, Romance Languages, Yale Univ.
*Helmut Rehder, Germanic Languages, Univ. of Texas
Leon Roudiez, French, Columbia Univ.
A. Donald Sellstrom, French and Italian, Univ. of Texas
John K. Simon, French and Italian, State Univ. of New York, Buffalo
Blake Lee Spahr, Comparative Literature, Univ. of California, Berkeley
Jack M. Stein, Germanic Languages, Harvard Univ.
*Roy E. Teele, Oriental and African Languages, Univ. of Texas
Renee Waldinger, Romance Languages, City College, CUNY
A. Leslie Willson, Germanic Languages, Univ. of Texas
Anthony N. Zahareas, Spanish and Portuguese, Univ. of Minnesota

Other

David W. Breneman, National Research Council, Washington, D.C.

*The asterisk designates chairmen's representatives.

Additional copies of this special joint issue of the ADE and ADFL *Bulletins* are available from the MLA Publications Center, 62 Fifth Ave., New York, N.Y. 10011, at a cost of $1.50 per copy. The discount price for orders of ten or more copies is $1.00 per copy. A handling charge of 50¢ is added to all orders under $5.00; orders under $10.00 must be *prepaid*.

ORDER FORM

Please ship _____ extra copies of *The Ph.D. in English and Foreign Languages: A Conference Report* at $ _____ each.

Total cost . . . . . _____

Handling Charge (if order is less than $5) .50

Amount Enclosed . . . . . _____

Name . . . . . .

Address . . . . . .

. . . . . .

City . . . . . State . . . . . Zip . . . . . .